

DeCoster

INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES ON CONTROVERSIAL TOPICS

A Special Report of

THE NASPA DIVISION OF
RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

NASPA

The Journal
of the
Association
of
Deans
and
Administrators
of
Student Affairs

MONOGRAPH NO. 1, JANUARY 1968

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

(THE ASSOCIATION OF DEANS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS FOUNDED IN 1919)

Carl W. Knox, *President*
Dean of Student Affairs
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida
O. D. Roberts, *President Designate*
Dean of Men
Purdue University
Conference Co-Chairman
Peter H. Armacost
President
Ottawa University, Kansas
Earle W. Clifford
Dean of Student Affairs
Rutgers, The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey
Richard A. Siggelkow, *Editor*
Dean of Students
SUNY, Buffalo, New York
J. Don Marsh, *Controller*
Associate Dean of Students
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan
E. G. Williamson,
Immediate Past President
Dean of Students
University of Minnesota

Regional Vice Presidents

- I William L. Swartzbaugh
Associate Dean of the College
Amherst College
- II Martin J. Meade
Vice-President and Dean of Students
Fordham University
- III James E. Foy
Dean of Student Affairs
Auburn University
- IV Burns B. Crookston
Dean of Students
Colorado State University
- V Robert F. Etheridge
Vice-President, Student Affairs
Miami University (Ohio)
- VI Channing Briggs
Dean of Students
Portland State College
- VII Lyle G. Reynolds
Dean of Students
University of California
(Santa Barbara)

Directors

Professional Relations and Legislation

Chester E. Peters
Vice-President, Student Affairs
Kansas State University

Professional Development and Standards

John L. Blackburn
Dean of Men
University of Alabama

Research and Publications

Thomas B. Dutton
Dean of Students
Oakland University

Association Personnel and Services

Preston Parr
Dean of Student Life
Lehigh University

Members-At-Large

Sam Basta
Dean of Student Affairs
University of Nevada
William F. Denman
Dean of Student Affairs
University of Arkansas
Arden O. French
Dean of Men
Louisiana State University
Mark W. Smith
Dean of Men
Denison University

Placement Officer

Richard E. Hulet
Vice-President for Student Services
Illinois State University, Normal

EDITORIAL BOARD

THREE YEAR TERM

WHEADON BLOCH
Dean of Students
University of Missouri
Kansas City, Missouri

JOHN E. SHAY JR.
Dean of Students
College of the Holy Cross
Worcester, Massachusetts

ALLEN E. IVEY
Director, University
Counseling Center
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

THEODORE K. MILLER
Assoc. Professor of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

WARREN SHIRLEY
Dean of Students
Florida A & M University

RONALD E. BARNES
Associate Editor
Dean of Students
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota

TWO YEAR TERM

ROBERT BOWLIN
Dean of Men
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

LESTER L. HALE
Dean of Students
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

JANE E. MATSON
Specialist for
Student Personnel Work
American Association
of Junior Colleges
Washington, D. C.

EDWARD C. MCGUIRE
Dean of Students
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island

FREDERICK J. SPECKEN
Vice President for
Educational Affairs
Lutheran University
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

RICHARD A. SIGGELKOW
Editor
Vice President for
Student Affairs
SUNY at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

ONE YEAR TERM

SAMUEL C. DAVIS
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

MEL DOYLE, O.F.M.
Dean of Students
Quincy College
Quincy, Illinois

ROBERT N. HUBBELL
Office of the Chancellor
University of California
Santa Barbara, California

VIRGINIA P. FROBES
Dean of Students
The University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

MIRIAM WAGENSCHNEIN
Dean of Women
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

ROBERT M. CRANE
Assistant Editor
Associate Director,
Division of Education
University of Illinois
Chicago Circle Campus

PRICE: \$1.50

MANUSCRIPTS: Manuscripts should be addressed to The Editor, 201 Harri-
man Library, State University of New York at Buffalo, 14214.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Annual subscription rate is \$3.00; single copies, \$1.00.

Checks should be made payable to NASPA and mailed to Controller, J. Don
Marsh, NASPA Central Office, Suite 405, International Inn, 5440 Cass
Avenue, Detroit, Michigan.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS should be sent to the Controller.

PUBLICATION: NASPA is published quarterly in July, October, January and
April.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Mante Abbott, Catherine Osborn.

INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES ON CONTROVERSIAL TOPICS

A Special Report
of
The NASPA Division of Research and Publications

Prepared and Presented
by
Thomas B. Dutton,
James R. Appleton &
Fred W. Smith

January 1968



Foreword

This study was conceived in 1965 by the Division of Research and Publications which felt that an investigation of the nature and purpose of institutional policies on a wide range of controversial issues would produce beneficial data for NASPA members and others in higher education.

It was obvious to the Division that deans of students were expected to cope with an increasing number of critical situations, but that they often were unable to bring the experience of other institutions to bear on the problems. It seemed that lack of knowledge of the policies and practices of other colleges and universities, either before or during a campus crisis, contributed, in part, to unwise or inadequate administrative responses which only served to aggravate the situation and to undermine the credibility and effectiveness of the dean and other institutional officials. The Division concluded that knowledge of how other institutions dealt with issues could form a basis for more sensible approaches to campus issues and problems, both in policy development and in the processing of difficult situations.

Members of the Division, under the leadership of Peter H. Armacost, formulated the purposes, design, and methodology of the study and developed the questionnaire which and distributed it to the NASPA member institutions. The task of tabulating and analyzing the data and writing the research report was assigned to Thomas B. Dutton, James R. Appleton, and Fred W. Smith with Dutton as coordinator and editor, and Appleton doing the computer programming and completing the statistical analyses. The responsibility for interpreting the data and writing the report was shared by the three writers.

We thank the Executive Committee of NASPA for supporting the project and for providing the necessary funds. In particular, we must gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the deans who labored to complete a long, open-ended questionnaire. Many respondents provided answers that reflected considerable thought and insight. We are also indebted to James M. Peters for his editorial assistance in the final report.

If time had permitted, it would have been useful to complete other analyses and to provide additional interpretive comments. It was decided, however, to limit the report to the present contents so that it could be made available while the data were still relevant.

The section on analysis of results is long and contains a substantial amount of detailed information for those who desire depth of understanding. In addition, the representative policy statements in Appendix A should be of worth to institutions that are, or will be, developing or modifying policies on the issues included in the study.

The main value of the study, in addition to its historical importance, probably lies in its presentation of data which can serve as background to update and reconsider current policies in the identified areas. It may well remind all of us, as we approach these areas within the framework of our *own* institutional needs and values, that *the time most appropriate to consider policies is prior to the crisis itself*.

THOMAS B. DUTTON
Editor



Table of Contents

	(Page)
Introduction	1
Design and Methodology	2
Analysis of Results	5
POLICIES RELATED TO INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR:	
Deviant sexual behavior	7
Dress and appearance	9
Drugs	11
Entertainment of members of the opposite sex in residence hall, bedrooms	13
Excessive use of alcoholic beverages	15
Financial irresponsibility	18
Unacceptable off-campus behavior	19
Premarital pregnancy	21
Required on-campus living	23
Recognition of student organizations	26
Women's hours	28
POLICIES RELATED TO FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION:	
Invitation of controversial speakers to campus	30
Student demonstrations	33
Responsibility of student publications to the college administration or faculty	35
POLICIES RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE-FACULTY PRACTICES BEARING ON STUDENT WELFARE:	
Faculty drinking with students	38
Provision of contraceptives	40
Use of student records	42
Use of students as research subjects	44
IMPORTANCE OF THE ISSUES TO THE INSTITUTIONS	46
COMPARISON AMONG INSTITUTIONS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF POLICY FORMULATION	49
Summary and Implications	52
MAJOR FINDINGS:	
Policies Related to the Eighteen Issues	53
Importance of the issues to the institutions	57
Comparison among institutions with regard to the degree of policy formulation	57
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	57
A COMPOSITE VIEW OF THE DATA	58
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	61
CONCLUDING REMARKS	62
Appendix A: Representative Policy Statements	
Deviant sexual behavior	67
Dress and appearance	68
Drugs	68
Entertainment of members of the opposite sex in residence hall bedrooms	69
Excessive use of alcohol	70
Financial irresponsibility	71
Unacceptable off-campus behavior	71
Premarital pregnancy	73
Required on-campus living	74
Recognition of student organizations	75
Women's hours	76
Invitation of controversial speakers to campus	77
Student demonstrations	78
Responsibility of student publication to the college administration or faculty	79
Faculty drinking with students	81
Provision of contraceptives (see text)	81
Use of student records	81
Use of students as research subjects	82

Appendix B: Questionnaire Excerpts

Appendix C: Supplementary Tables (Tab. 44-50)

Consistency of policy implementation	86
Desirability of the policies	87
How were the policies established?	88
Who formulated the policies?	89
Who acted on violations of the policies?	90
What action was taken when the policies were violated?	91
Rank ordering of issues on basis of their significance to the institutions	92

List of Tables

	(Page)
Table 1: Type of Institutions	3
Table 2: Size of Institutions	2
Table 3: Percentage of Student Body Living On Campus	3
Table 4: Regional Accrediting Association	4
Table 5: Policies Regarding Deviant Sexual Behavior	7
Table 6: Purposes of Policies Regarding Deviant Sexual Behavior	8
Table 7: Policies Regarding Dress and Appearance	10
Table 8: Purposes of Policies Regarding Dress and Appearances	10
Table 9: Policies Regarding Drugs	11
Table 10: Purposes of Policies Regarding Drugs	12
Table 11: Policies Regarding Entertainment of Members of Opposite Sex in Residence Hall Bedrooms	13
Table 12: Purposes of Policies Regarding Entertainment of Members of Opposite Sex in Residence Hall Bedrooms	14
Table 13: Policies Regarding Excessive Use of Alcoholic Beverages	16
Table 14: Purposes of Policies Regarding Excessive Use of Alcohol	17
Table 15: Policies Regarding Financial Irresponsibility	18
Table 16: Purposes of Policies Regarding Financial Irresponsibility	19
Table 17: Policies Regarding Unacceptable Off-Campus Behavior	20
Table 18: Purposes of Policies Regarding Unacceptable Off-Campus Behavior	21
Table 19: Policies Regarding Premarital Pregnancy	22
Table 20: Purposes of Policies Regarding Premarital Pregnancy	23
Table 21: Policies Regarding Required On-Campus Living	24
Table 22: Purposes of Policies Regarding Required On-Campus Living	25
Table 23: Policies Regarding Recognition of Student Organizations	26
Table 24: Purposes of Policies Regarding Recognition of Student Organizations	27
Table 25: Policies Regarding Women's Hours	28
Table 26: Purposes of Policies Regarding Women's Hours	29
Table 27: Policies Regarding Invitation of Controversial Speakers to Campus	30
Table 28: Purposes of Policies Regarding Invitation of Controversial Speakers	32
Table 29: Policies Regarding Student Demonstration	33
Table 30: Purposes of Policies Regarding Student Demonstrations	35
Table 31: Policies Regarding Responsibility of Student Publications to the College Adminis- tration or Faculty	36
Table 32: Purposes of Policies Regarding Responsibility of Student Publications to the College Administration or Faculty	37
Table 33: Policies Regarding Faculty Drinking with Students	38
Table 34: Purposes of Policies Regarding Faculty Drinking with Students	39
Table 35: Policies Regarding the Provision of Contraceptives	41
Table 37: Policies Regarding Use of Student Records	42
Table 38: Purposes of Policies Regarding Use of Student Records	43
Table 39: Policies Regarding Use of Students as Research Subjects	45
Table 40: Purposes of Policies Regarding Use of Students as Research Subjects	45
Table 41: Frequency with which Issues were Ranked in the Upper One Third	47
Table 42: Inter-institutional Comparisons (By Type, Size, Percentage of Student Body Living on Campus and Region) with Regard to the Degree of Policy Formulation on the Eighteen Topics	49
Table 43: Degree of Policy Formulation on the Eighteen Issues	59
Table 44: Consistency of Policy Implementation	86
Table 45: Desirability of the Policies	87
Table 46: How Were the Policies Established?	88
Table 47: Who Formulated the Policies?	89
Table 48: Who Acted on Violations of the Policies?	90
Table 49: What Action Was Taken When the Policies Were Violated?	91
Table 50: Rank Ordering of Issues on the Basis of Their Significance to the Institutions	92

Introduction

Student personnel administrators must make decisions in areas where institutional policies or clear, well-conceived guidelines for action are lacking. Moreover, administrators are often unaware of policies of other institutions—knowledge that might form the basis for more intelligent judgments in solving problems. Too often in crisis-oriented situations, therefore, administrators are forced to act without the benefit of established policies or the thinking and experience of others in the field. Intensification of a problem might be avoided if those involved had a wider understanding of different approaches to problems and if institutional policies were clearly formulated. Advanced thought and well-developed policies might be the difference between an institution-wide crisis and the routine processing of a problem.

One of the primary objectives of the Division of Research and Publications is to conduct and stimulate research of value to student personnel administrators in reaching intelligent decisions concerning important issues and problems. This study was designed *to determine institutional policies with regard to selected controversial topics which are frequently the focus of administrative concern and action*, by gathering base-line data about the extent to which colleges and universities have formulated institutional policies on 18 controversial topics, the purposes and rationale for these policies, the methods by which the policies were formulated, the nature of their implementation, and the extent to which the 18 issues were considered significant. In addition, some attempt was made to determine whether any differences existed among institutions of varying size, of varying types, with varying percentages of the student body living on campus and in various geographic regions with regard to the extent of policy formulation on each of the 18 topics.

The inquiry was not designed to provide complete data on all issues for all institutions. Instead, it was constructed to produce sufficient information so that student personnel administrators *would have a sense of policies and practices on a wide range of issues in a substantial number of institutions*. Still another aim was to identify areas in which the need for more intensive research was indicated.

It was not assumed that a set of panaceas or clear answers would result. Nor was it assumed that the investigation was associated with any effort to produce uniform policies and actions at the expense of the pluralism and diversity which have long been valued in American colleges and universities. The investigation was, instead, an attempt to obtain data that could be adapted to the local setting with its unique characteristics.

Sample policy statements for 17 of the 18 issues have been included as Appendix A. An attempt has been made to present policies that represent the major categories in the tables dealing with content of the policies. Due to space limitations, it was not always possible to use the statements in their entirety; in editing them, however, every effort was made to retain those parts that were most essential and most relevant.

The data were gathered by a questionnaire developed by the members of the Division of Research and Publications¹ and sent to a number of student personnel administrators for reaction and refinement before its completion.

¹The members were: Peter H. Armacost (Director), President, Ottawa University; Thomas B. Dutton, Dean of Students, Oakland University; Jerry H. Godard, Acting Dean, Guilford College; Jack W. Graham, Dean of Students, Southern Illinois University; Mark W. Smith, Dean of Men, Denison University; and Phillip A. Tripp, Research Specialist, Bureau of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education.

Design and Methodology

The 18 issues were selected by the Division with the purpose of including items current and troublesome to practicing administrators on which general knowledge of institutional policies and practices was somewhat limited.

The division was aware that on some issues only a portion of the institutions in the sample would have formally enacted policies, but it was made clear that information on informal as well as formal policies was being sought. The questionnaire was designed to secure data on unwritten, as well as written, policies or guidelines.

The division decided to employ only the questionnaire as a source of data because there was need to obtain data from all NASPA member institutions as quickly as possible on a large number of issues, there were neither sufficient funds nor time to permit a more exhaustive investigation, and the questionnaire seemed to be adequate in design to produce the base-line data needed. (Representative pages of the instrument are included as Appendix B.)

The 18 controversial topics identified for the study were divided evenly between two forms of the questionnaire, (A) and (B); each form was sent to half the 457 NASPA institutions. Of these institutions, 348, or 76 percent, completed the questionnaire; 194 (A) and 154 (B) questionnaires were returned. After the initial letter was sent to member institutions, two follow-up mailings were made. In the tables that follow, N's reported as less than 194 or 154, as appropriate, indicate either non-response (s) or unusable response (s) to specific items.

Most of the data presented were elicited in open-ended form. To facilitate analysis of these prose responses, categories were identified for each item, and then the open-ended comments were coded according to the established categories, developed by three people studying the responses separately, then finalizing the categories in discussion with one another.

Tables 1 & 2 presents the data on the type and size of institutions that completed the questionnaire.

TABLE 2
Size of Institutions

Category	Percent (N=348)
Enrollment less than 1,500	27
Enrollment 1,500-5,000	25
Enrollment more than 5,000	48

TABLE 1
Type of Institutions

Category	Percent (N=347)
Public liberal arts college	8
Public university	32
Independent liberal arts college	12
Independent university	9
Church-related college or university (Catholic)	11
Church-related college or university (Protestant)	22
Teachers college	2
Technical institution	4

Only a small number of institutions housed all their students on the campus (Table 3). 40 percent accommodated more than two-thirds of their students. About 80 percent of the institutions had on-campus populations ranging from "moderate" to "large" in size.

TABLE 3
Percentage of Student Body Living on Campus

Category	Percent (N=344)
Fewer than 33%	24
33-66%	36
More than 66%, but not all	36
All live on campus	4

Nearly half the institutions were members of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, while one-quarter were part of the association for New England and the Middle States (Table 4). The sample, then, is dominated by North Central institutions, and to a lesser extent by schools in New England and the Middle States.

TABLE 4
Regional Accrediting Association

Category	Percent (N=347)
New England and Middle States	26
Southern	16
North Central	44
Western and Northwest	14

The primary purposes of this investigation, as outlined in the introduction, were accomplished outside any theoretical framework. In order to explore the differences in the degree of policy formulation among institutions of various sizes, types, locations and percentages of students living on campus, however, it was deemed appropriate to develop the following broad research hypothesis:

It is possible to differentiate among the member institutions by size, region, type of institution and percentage of students living on campus with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the 18 topics.

This comparison among institutions was made on the basis of institutional response to the question asked on each of the 18 issues, "Do you have an institutional policy with regard to...?" The three structured responses to this question were: "No, the institution should not have a policy on the subject" ("None" in the tables) "No, but we maintain an institutional concern with this matter" "None, but concerned" in the tables; or "Yes, we have a policy."

Null hypotheses were formulated.

Null Hypothesis I. No differences exist among the (1) public liberal arts colleges, (2) public universities, (3) independent liberal arts colleges, (4) independent universities, (5) church-related colleges or universities (Catholic), (6) church-related colleges or universities (Protestant), (7) teachers' colleges or (8) technical institutions with regard to policy formulation on each of the 18 issues:

Null Hypothesis II. No differences exist among institutions of (1) fewer than 1,500 students, (2) 1,500 to 5,000 students, or (3) more than 5,000 students with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the above 18 issues.

Null Hypothesis III. No differences exist among institutions with (1) less than 33 percent of the student body living on campus, (2) 33 percent to 66 percent on campus, (3) more than 66 percent on campus, or (4) all living on campus with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the above 18 issues.

Null Hypothesis IV. No differences exist among the institutions in the New England and Middle States, Southern, North Central or Western regions of the country with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the above 18 issues.

Simple tallies and percentages were used most often in organizing the entire study, and Chi-square (X^2) was the statistical technique used to test the null hypotheses previously stated. The distributions were analyzed to determine how closely the observed number of responses in a given category approximated an expected theoretical distribution. The .05 level of significance was used for all tests as the criterion to reject the null hypotheses. All references to "significant differences" throughout this document pertain to *statistical* significance as determined by the Chi-square test.

The analysis was completed on the CDC 3600 computer and the appropriate complementary data processing equipment.

Analysis of Results

This report is primarily an analysis of two key factors as they relate to the issues under scrutiny: to what degree there were formulated policies governing each issue and what the content of the policies was. Representative excerpts from policy statements—in some cases, the entire statements—are compiled as Appendix A, to illustrate the variety of institutional positions regarding the various issues. In addition, data are presented on: the purposes of the policies, the degree to which policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated, the specific individuals or groups who were primarily responsible for policy formulation, the individuals or groups who played dominant roles in processing violations of policy, and the type of action taken when the policies were not observed. A ranking of the 18 issues indicates the relative level of institutional concern regarding each issue. Finally, a comparison of the various institutions in the sample—by size, type, location, and percentage of students living on campus—with regard to the degree of policy formulation is included.

Three additional items on the questionnaire require mention because they are not discussed in the analysis of results. Respondents were asked to comment on the "consistency of implementation" of each policy, and to indicate whether or not each policy, as implemented, represented in their opinion the most desirable approach to the problem. Most respondents felt their policies were implemented well (Table 44), and that they represented the best means of dealing with the problem to which they were directed (Table 45). On most issues, this support exceeded 80 percent! Those issues on which there was some indication of inconsistent implementation were dress and appearance, student publications, and faculty-student drinking. There was some evidence that specific policies dealing with dress and appearance and women's hours were not the most desirable.

Respondents also were asked to indicate how they thought their presidents, academic deans and student personnel officers conceived the purpose of social conduct regulations. Were they merely devices for maintaining order within the college community? Were they also essential expressions of a value system which the institution wished its students to assimilate? Three hundred thirty-five, or 95 percent, of the respondents who answered felt that the administration saw such regulations as both an expression of a value system and a means of controlling student behavior. In other words, stated standards of conduct were considered to be more than just controlling devices; they were seen as a part of a total educational program.

POLICIES RELATED TO INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Deviant Sexual Behavior

POLICY—Table 5 shows that 60 percent of the institutions had policies dealing with this behavior. Only about one-tenth viewed the problem strictly as a health or counseling matter. Over 40 percent treated the behavior through some type of disciplinary or forced-help action. Only a few schools approached the problem from a legal viewpoint.

TABLE 5
Policies Regarding Deviant Sexual Behavior

Policy	Percent (N=154)
None	15
None, but concerned	25
Have policy, but did not state it	2
Policy categories:	
Treat such behavior as a health-counseling problem	13
Take corrective action (discipline, forced therapy or forced withdrawal)	17
Handle problem in accordance with civil law	2
Act only when behavior is public or detrimental to the campus or others	23
Expect their students to observe standards of good taste and propriety	3

Some institutions had no specific policies but acted on the misconduct in the context of a general conduct statement. Typically, such policies stipulated that students were expected to observe high standards of personal conduct or generally accepted moral and social conventions and were to be held responsible for their actions.

Some institutions took the position that each case should be treated individually on the basis of a thorough evaluation of the relevant factors. If it seemed that the student could function satisfactorily with supportive counseling, he would be permitted to continue in

the institution. If it were concluded that he was unable to meet his responsibilities as a student, he would be given a medical withdrawal with the understanding that he would need a psychiatric clearance at the time of readmission. The institution attempted to establish whether it was mutually beneficial for the student to remain in the academic community. In a limited number of instances, the behavior was approached entirely from the counseling viewpoint, and steps were taken to help the student without recourse to discipline or forced withdrawal.

PURPOSE—Stated purposes of the policies are recorded in Table 6. The data indicate that, in nearly two-thirds of the institutions with stated policies, policies were to maintain campus standards, to insure responsible behavior, and to protect the community and the campus image. Only one-quarter of the responses were associated with helping the student through counseling. This is consistent with the data in Table 5 regarding the nature of the policies recorded. Clearly, the largest share of the institutions with policies viewed the problem as one of control and discipline, rather than rehabilitation.

TABLE 6
Purposes of Policies Regarding Deviant Sexual Behavior

Purpose	Percent (N=60*)
Help student through counseling	24
Maintain educational objectives and philosophy	8
Maintain campus standards, control and responsible behavior; protect the community	62
Protect campus image	3
Uphold the law	3

**N inflated by 10 combination responses.*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Although 60 percent of the institutions had policies on deviant sexual behavior, only 23 percent had statements formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). Sixty-four percent of the policies were "just agreed upon within the administration" or considered to be simply a matter of consistent practice.

The student personnel staff was mentioned most frequently (42 percent) as the agency responsible for development of the policy (Table 47). In only 17 percent of the institutions was the policy formulated by a body including representatives outside the adminis-

tration. In over one-half, responsibility rested with an administrative council or with the student personnel staff. This, coupled with the fact that 74 percent of the policies were not formally adopted, indicates that the problem was not considered to be an issue subject to wide discussion or community participation or part of normal decision-making processes.

The personnel dean or his staff was mentioned most frequently (42 percent) as responsible for processing violations of the policy (Table 48). A conduct committee acting independently, or such a committee acting in combination with a student judiciary, was designated as the disciplinary agent by 48 percent. It is interesting to note that 23 percent of the respondents indicated that students played some role in the processing of deviant sexual behavior cases.

Twenty-seven percent of the institutions for which data were received employed discussion or counseling when acts of sexual deviation were discovered (Table 49). Forty-three percent took disciplinary action, while 32 percent dismissed the student. Thirty percent indicated that their action depended on the nature of the case. Clearly, the most prevalent pattern was to discipline the student, again, consistent with the nature and purpose of the policies as described previously.

It should be noted that the number of responses on all but the question dealing with the content of policy was about one-half the sample. One might speculate that although over 60 percent of the institutions had some type of policy, means of implementation were not worked out because the incidence of deviant sexual behavior was not great, or because community pressures for instituting specific procedures in accordance with due process of law might not have been of sufficient intensity to force the institutions to to clarify such procedures.

Dress and Appearance

POLICY—Sixty-six percent of the respondents indicated that their institutions had a policy dealing with dress and appearance, and another 14 percent stated that their institutions were "concerned" with the problem but did not have a stated position (Table 7). A prescribed dress code—for the entire campus or only dining and residential areas—was in effect in 41 percent of the institutions, while 18 percent expected students to maintain standards of good taste but did not prescribe a code.

Institutions without detailed codes but expecting students to comply with some general standard usually stated their policies in terms such as this: "Neat personal appearance and appropriate dress are required of all students on the campus."

PURPOSE—As recorded in Table 8, over one-third stated that their policies were intended to contribute to student development while nearly two-fifths indicated that their objective was to maintain a desirable campus atmosphere. The problem was not viewed in strictly educational terms, but rather in relation to control of behavior or development of a desirable campus atmosphere.

TABLE 7
Policies Regarding Dress and Appearance

Policy	Percent (N=153)
None	20
None, but concerned	14
Have policy, but did not state it	6
Policy categories:	
Prescribe dress code for entire campus	29
Prescribe dress code for dining/residential areas	12
Expect students to maintain standards of good taste	18
Allows each student to set his own dress standards	1

TABLE 8
Purposes of Policies Regarding Dress and Appearance

Purpose	Percent (N=102*)
Contribute to education of students	35
Maintain desirable campus atmosphere	39
Maintain control, order, and health standards	19
Protect campus image	7
<i>*N inflated by 25 combination responses.</i>	

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Table 46 presents data on policy formulation. Over three-fourths of the policies had been formally adopted; 71 percent indicated formal adoption and systematic communication.

Most commonly mentioned as agencies responsible for development of policy were student/faculty/administrative committees (26 percent). Other agencies were: student government (18 percent), student personnel staff (12 percent) and governing board (6 percent) (See Table 47).

The personnel dean or his staff most frequently (51 percent) processed violations of dress standards (Table 48). The student committee category was cited by 25 percent of the respondents, and some combination of such a committee with a university conduct committee by 23 percent. Forty-eight percent of the respondents said that students were involved in some way in the discipline process.

Table 49 indicates that violations of dress standards were not treated as highly serious problems. The most common practice was to counsel with the student (25 percent), warn or reprimand him (27 percent), or require him to leave the area until the dress problem was corrected (27 percent). The fact that institutions tended to view dress code violations as problems resolvable through milder sanctions might account for the substantial degree of student involvement in processing of violations, as well as the strong role personnel staffs play in this area—without referral to any university conduct committee.

Drugs (Narcotics, Hallucinogens, Marihuana, Stimulants, and Depressants)

POLICY—All but one of the 194 member institutions that completed questionnaires responded to this item. Seven percent indicated that they had no policy and should not establish one (Table 9). Over 50 percent indicated that they had no policy but maintained an institutional concern. Such institutional concern often seemed particularly noticeable when use of drugs was suspected on the campus. Responses from many campuses indicated clear disapproval of misuse of drugs, a willingness to support state laws regarding them, a concern for student welfare in the matter, and a desire to take specific action when violations were established.

TABLE 9
Policies Regarding Drugs

Policy	Percent (N=193)
None	7
None, but concerned	52
Have policy, but did not state it	8
Policy categories:	
Forbid drugs, refer all cases to civil authorities	3
Forbid drugs, treat cases internally through normal disciplinary channels	19
Treat primarily as health or counseling problem	4
Take action only when misuse is disruptive to the life of the university community	7

Only 42 percent stated that their institutions had an established policy regarding this matter. Eight percent did not state their policies, except to indicate that offenders were treated under the rubric of general conduct expectations. Three percent indicated that use of drugs was forbidden and that violators, or suspected violators, would be referred to civil authorities for treatment and investigation. Nineteen percent stated that although the health and emotional state of offenders were important concerns, use of drugs was forbidden and both seller and user were disciplined through regular channels to the greatest extent possible. Cooperation with civil law enforcement agencies could occur, but immediate referral was not seen as a useful first step. A few of these institutions differentiated between seller and user—suspending the seller, but treating the user within a counseling framework or in a less severe manner. Four percent indicated that they were primarily concerned with the health and welfare of the individuals. These institutions did not routinely treat offenses through regular disciplinary channels except as a “last resort” or simply to “curb sale of the drug.” Seven percent indicated that they took action only when misuse of drugs became disruptive to the life of the academic community.

PURPOSE—Although member institutions may, in fact, be able to point to a number of reasons for the development of their policies regarding the use of drugs by students, certain *primary* reasons emerged and are noted in Table 10.

TABLE 10
Purposes of Policies Regarding Drugs

Purpose	Percent (N=89*)
Support state laws	17
Maintain campus standards, control or institutional values	30
Be consistent with the educational objectives of the institution	5
Maintain campus image	5
Protect students from harm	37
Help individual students	6

*N inflated by 4 combination responses.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—A number of pertinent tallies and percentages are listed in the appendices (Tables 46, 47, 48 and 49), but a few general comments are in order. Almost 60 percent of the respondents stated that their policies regarding drugs were informally agreed upon within the administration, or were simply a matter of con-

sistent practice. Only 28 percent had formally adopted and systematically communicated their policies. Although member institutions were concerned about use and misuse of drugs, inadequate policy development seemed to be the pattern. Those policies which were formulated were most often formulated by the student personnel staff, occasionally by an administrative council or a student/faculty/administrative committee.

The usual consequences of violations, when handled through disciplinary channels, were rather severe. Thirty-two percent of those responding stated that their institution tended to suspend offenders. The student personnel staffs or conduct committees handled 88 percent of these disciplinary cases.

Entertainment of Members of the Opposite Sex in Residence Hall Bedrooms

POLICY—Eighty-seven percent of the institutions in the sample had some type of policy on this issue (Table 11). Nearly one-half of the schools prohibited visitation in bedrooms while 21 percent permitted it on special occasions on some controlled, limited basis. Only 12 percent allowed it on a regular, continuing basis. The bulk of the institutions, then, either did not permit visitation or allowed it occasionally under controlled conditions.

TABLE 11
Policies Regarding Entertainment
of Members of Opposite Sex in Residence Hall Bedrooms

Policy	Percent (N=154)
None	8
None, but concerned	5
Have policy, but did not state it	5
Policy categories:	
Prohibit visitation in bedrooms	48
Permit on special occasions or on a limited basis	21
Permit on a regular basis at certain times each week	12
Permits visitation at any time	1

A common institutional position was that room visitation was not necessary, because adequate facilities were provided for coeducational activities in the common areas of the residence halls. It was felt that the common areas offered sufficient privacy for students.

Many institutional policies stated explicitly that entertaining in bedrooms was not only prohibited, but that it was subject to strict discipline—including dismissal—if verified. Exceptions to the regulations could be made by a staff member, of course, for relatives or in case of emergencies.

Another approach was to prohibit visitation except in a limited number of registered, supervised open houses. When visitation was permitted on some regular basis, usually on Saturday and Sunday afternoons, guests might be required to sign in and out, and students might be expected to leave their doors open. Whatever the arrangement, students usually were asked to behave responsibly and in accordance with institutional standards.

PURPOSE—The most frequent reason (42 percent) for a policy was to maintain desirable behavior and campus standards of conduct (Table 12). Close to one-third stated that the purpose of their policy was to support the objectives and philosophy of the institution. Only 13 percent indicated that their policies were intended to permit student privacy and give them the opportunity to cope with greater freedom.

TABLE 12
Purposes of Policies Regarding Entertainment
of Members of Opposite Sex in Residence Hall Bedrooms

Purpose	Percent (N=116*)
Fulfill objectives and philosophy of the institution	31
Protect student privacy	4
Permit student privacy	7
Maintain desirable behavior and conduct standards	42
Maintain desirable campus image	1
Permit students to learn to exercise freedom responsibly	6
Feel bedrooms are not designed for entertainment	9

**N inflated by 3 combination responses.*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Seventy-nine percent of the respondents indicated that their policies had been adopted in a formal manner and that they were communicated systematically to students (Table 46). Clearly, the visitation issue was treated as a significant matter—which is not surprising, in view of the explosive nature of the problem.

Table 47 presents data naming those responsible for policy development, by title. The groups mentioned most frequently were student/faculty/administrative committees (22 percent), governing board (20 percent), an administrative council (18 percent) and student personnel staffs (18 percent). Two-thirds of the institutions asked a formally established body to formulate the policy; student involvement in policy formulation was limited. Apparently, the problems connected with visitation were such that key campus policy-making bodies were usually involved in the decision-making process.

The personnel dean, or a member of his staff, was designated by nearly one-half the institutions as the official responsible for processing problems related to misconduct in the matter of visitation (Table 48). Essentially all the remaining respondents said that a student committee, or institutional conduct committee, or a combination of both, dealt with violations. Forty-three percent reported that students were involved with the process.

Penalties imposed when violations of visitation rules occurred are presented in Table 49. Actions taken most frequently were: Dismissal (31 percent) and fines/work/limitation of privileges (29 percent). Twenty-six percent of the respondents said that the course of action followed would depend on the nature of the case. It should be noted that 43 percent of the respondents indicated that penalties less than dismissal were imposed. This fact, coupled with the number of institutions that reported they processed each case on its own merits, suggests that visitation violations in the largest share of institutions were treated with moderation.

Excessive Use of Alcoholic Beverages

POLICY—Eighty-eight percent of the institutions that submitted data for the study reported that they had a policy on excessive consumption of alcoholic beverages (Table 13). One-quarter indicated that use of alcohol was not permitted, either generally or on campus. They did not comment specifically on overuse of alcohol. Another quarter stated that disciplinary action would be taken when excessive consumption resulted in harm to the student or the community. Otherwise, they would act when a behavioral problem was created. One-fifth of the institutions indicated that the problem would be treated as a disciplinary matter, but did not stipulate the conditions under which action would be taken. An additional nine percent of the respondents said that excessive use of alcohol was not permitted under any circumstances.

Over half of the institutions, then, were opposed to overuse by students. Including the institutions stating only that alcohol was not permitted at all, 80 percent had taken—either directly or indirectly—negative positions concerning the problem.

Many policy statements clearly prohibited the use of alcohol on the campus, as well as excessive use, without reference to disciplinary action. Other statements, however, indicated that disciplinary action would be taken, and some policies stipulated that particular penalties would be imposed—such as dismissal from the institution.

In some cases, institutions did not have specific policies covering excessive use of alcohol, but rather, treated the behavior with reference to a general conduct statement such as, "A student is held responsible for his behavior at all times."

Although most institutional policies dealt with control of excessive consumption through disciplinary action, one school's policy was, "Individuals with drinking problems are counseled and referred to the mental health unit of the student health center."

TABLE 13
Policies Regarding Excessive Use of Alcoholic Beverages

Policy	Percent (N=154)
None	4
None, but concerned	8
Have policy, but did not state it	5
Policy categories:	
Enforce community laws	3
Do not permit alcohol	25
Take disciplinary action when excessive use of alcohol results in harm to student or community	25
Take disciplinary action in cases of excessive use of alcohol, but did not specify conditions	21
Do not permit excessive use of alcohol	9

As Table 13 indicates, there were variations in how cases of excessive use of alcohol were processed. Some institutions took some type of disciplinary action in all, or almost all, cases; others acted only if the behavior was extreme or detrimental to others, or if it had occurred on previous occasions; others made it clear that such conduct was not acceptable and tried to help the student through counseling.

PURPOSE—The purposes behind the policies are recorded in Table 14.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—The bulk (76 percent) of the institutions had policies that were formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). Nearly eighty percent of the institutions had policies that were, at least, formally adopted. It should also be noted that over three-fourths of the institutions indicated that their policy was communicated in some organized and consistent manner.

The same consistency of practice was not found concerning responsibility for development of the policy (Table 47). The two groups most commonly mentioned as responsible were the governing board (28 percent) and a student/faculty/administrative committee

TABLE 14
Purposes of Policies Regarding Excessive Use of Alcohol

Purpose	Percent (N=129*)
Support laws of community	14
Maintain control, order and responsible behavior	25
Maintain institutional objectives and proper educational climate	36
Maintain desirable campus image	1
Discourage use and abuse of alcohol	20
Educate students regarding use of alcohol	4
<i>*N inflated by 18 combination responses.</i>	

(23 percent). In only 11 percent of the schools did responsibility rest with the student personnel staff. The data indicate that in the largest share of the institutions, the policy was established by some official body somewhat representative of the community, or at least part of the community.

Respondents were also asked to indicate who acts when policy is violated. In 33 percent of the institutions completing the item, the dean of students or some member of his staff processed the violation and decided what penalty should be imposed (Table 48). In 63 percent of the institutions, a campus-wide conduct committee, a student conduct committee or some combination of the two were given responsibility for administering disciplinary action.

Table 49 presents the data relative to the type of action taken when violations occurred. The prevalent response was that the action administered would depend on the nature of the case (35 percent). Over 50 percent of the sanctions reported amounted to action less severe than separation from the institution; used most frequently were fines, work, limitation of privileges, probation (33 percent) and discussion or counseling (19 percent). Dismissal from the institution was indicated as a penalty on only 10 percent of the questionnaires. It is significant that penalties of less than dismissal were used so frequently, and that so many institutions did not have pre-established penalties but, rather, permitted the circumstances of the particular violation to dictate the sanction.

Financial Irresponsibility (Unpaid Bills with the College, Outstanding Loans, Bad Checks, etc.)

POLICY—As presented in Table 15, only three percent of the respondents indicated that they did not have a policy; and an additional 14 percent stated that they had no policy, but had an institutional concern when specific problems were brought to the attention of the institution.

TABLE 15
Policies Regarding Financial Irresponsibility

Policy	Percent (N=193)
None	3
None, but concerned	14
Have policy, but did not state it	6
Policy categories:	
Treat under "general conduct" statement	32
Have specific policy covering both on-campus and off-campus irregularities	12
Have specific policy for on-campus only, counsel for off-campus irresponsibilities	13
Have specific policy for on-campus irresponsibilities only	20

Eighty-three percent of the respondents stated their institutions had an established policy regarding this matter. Six percent of these did not state their policy; another 32 percent indicated that offenders were treated within the framework of general conduct expectations, without specific reference to financial irresponsibility. The remaining 45 percent had developed specific policies covering on-campus irresponsibility, and they differ only in the degree of concern given to off-campus financial matters.

PURPOSE—It is evident that a number of reasons for policy regarding financial irresponsibility may be considered by any given institution; the intent here was to identify the most important or primary rationale. As presented in Table 16, 53 percent of the respondents indicated that the policy was designed to be "an educational tool to teach individual responsibility for financial affairs." Another one-third pointed to concern for the financial protection of the institution as their primary purpose.

TABLE 16
Purposes of Policies Regarding Financial Irresponsibility

Purpose	Percent (N=148*)
Maintain campus standard and ideals	7
Maintain campus image and community relations	9
Protect financial status of the institution	31
Teach individual responsibility	53
<i>*N inflated by 16 combination responses.</i>	

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Almost half the respondents said that their policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). If nothing else, this indicates that substantial attention is given the matter. The majority of policies were formulated by administrative councils, governing boards or student personnel staff members (Table 47).

Very few of the institutions indicated such disciplinary consequences as probation or dismissal in case of violation. Rather, the usual response was to bar future registration or withhold grades, transcripts or graduation records (Table 49). The dean of students' staff, often in concert with the business office, handled most violations (Table 48).

Unacceptable Off-Campus Behavior

POLICY—As noted in Table 17, four percent of the 192 respondents stated they had no policy with regard to unacceptable off-campus behavior; another 14 percent indicated they had no policy, but maintained an institutional concern regarding the matter.

Of the 82 percent with policies, 33 percent, the largest single block of respondents, accepted some responsibility for student behavior off-campus and used a general conduct statement as their basis for action. The assumption was made that conduct policies, standards and regulations applied equally on- and off-campus.

Fifteen percent felt a responsibility for taking action in event of off-campus misbehavior, even in those instances when civil action was also taken. Specific reference was made to off-campus behavior as a part of a university code of conduct. Another one-fifth of the respondents relied on civil authorities to enforce laws and evidenced university concern only when student behavior was detrimental to the welfare of the institution, or when asked by civil authorities to act. Less than 10 percent stated that students off-campus were responsible only to state and local civil officials, as any citizen in the community would be. Although no clear policy statement was cited by any of these respondents, they indicated an unwillingness to become involved in matters beyond the campus bound-

aries. Some inferred that it was not possible to consistently implement campus regulations in the surrounding communities.

TABLE 17
Policies Regarding Unacceptable Off-campus Behavior

Policy	Percent (N=192)
None	4
None, but concerned	14
Have policy, but did not state it	6
Policy categories:	
Have general policy about expected behavior, whether on- or off-campus	33
Handle violations through both civil and university authorities; specific university codes back up civil law	15
Violation of civil laws makes a student liable for civil action; university acts only when student behavior is detrimental to the welfare of the institution, or when requested to act by civil authorities	20
Students responsible to state and local civil authorities, just as is any citizen of the community	8

PURPOSE—Analysis of Table 18 reveals that only a small number of the respondents developed their regulations regarding off-campus behavior primarily in order to support existing community law. Twenty-two percent posited maintenance of the campus image as primary rationale for their policies. This figure presents an interesting comparison with the rationale developed for others of the 18 issues discussed in the study. Fifteen percent cited a primary concern for the welfare of the students; 30 percent hoped that their policies fostered responsibility and self-discipline. The latter institutions tended to be the same ones that encouraged enforcement of civil laws—without imposing any institutional restrictions.

TABLE 18
Purposes of Policies Regarding
Unacceptable Off-Campus Behavior

Purpose	Percent (N=126*)
Support state laws	3
Maintain campus standards, control or institutional values	30
Maintain campus image	22
Implement concern for welfare and development of student	15
Encourage adult community responsibilities and self-discipline	30

**N inflated by 3 combination responses.*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Appendix C (Tables 46, 47, 48, and 49) provides additional tallies and percentages, but a few comments are in order here.

Almost 70 percent of the respondents stated that their policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated, indicating that a good deal of attention had been given to this issue. The policies were most often formulated by student/faculty/administrative committees, but also they were frequently established by administrative councils or the student personnel staff. Student or faculty committees were very infrequently involved.

Fifty-two percent of the respondents indicated that the consequences in case of violation would vary, depending upon the circumstances surrounding the incident. Conduct committees processed 53 percent of the violations while the personnel staff was mentioned in all but one percent of the remaining instances. Although a relatively high percentage of respondents verbalized their policies regarding unacceptable off-campus behavior, there was a surprising lack of specificity in their expectations. No clear guidelines for handling violations were communicated.

Premarital Pregnancy

POLICY—The responses of member institutions on this issue clearly indicated a lack of policy development (Table 19).

Fifty percent of the institutions had no policy regarding premarital pregnancy. Another one percent had a policy but provided no statement and seven percent indicated that their policies allowed for the handling of each situation according to the attendance circumstances.

TABLE 19
Policies Regarding Premarital Pregnancy

Policy	Percent (N=191)
None	21
None, but concerned	29
Has policy, but did not state it	1
Policy categories:	
Handle each case individually	7
Consider premarital pregnancy an act of misconduct and treat with disciplinary action	11
Act administratively for benefit of student and institution (i. e., medical withdrawal)	23
Treat primarily as counseling or health concern; base action on such concern	7
Refers to parents	1

The remainder of the respondents were more specific. One-tenth of the institutions considered premarital pregnancy an act of misconduct to be treated by disciplinary action. A few institutions expected both the woman and man, if known, to withdraw after the completion of the term; readmission was allowed after the arrival of the baby. Occasionally, institutions offered a "dismissal or marriage option." Others, often church schools, re-emphasized the seriousness of breaking a moral law by subjecting the student to disciplinary probation or dismissal.

Twenty-three percent reported that they took administrative action that benefited the individual student, and that such action was outside normal disciplinary channels. Although all respondents would certainly be concerned for the individual's health and emotional stability, only seven percent indicated that action was based *solely* on counseling or health concerns. One percent made speedy referral to parents and accepted the parental recommendations.

PURPOSE—An unusually large number of the respondents, 131 of 194, provided no rationale for their policies or positions (Table 20). Of those who did, over one-half indicated a primary concern for campus standards, control or institutional values. Twenty-nine percent were concerned with helping students while the remainder desired to maintain educational objectives and campus image and to encourage family involvement.

TABLE 20
Purposes of Policies Regarding Premarital Pregnancy

Purpose	Percent (N=65*)
Maintain campus standards, control or institutional values	52
Be consistent with educational objectives of institution	5
Maintain campus image	8
Help individual students	29
Encourage family involvement	6

**N inflated by 2 combination responses.*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—As noted more specifically in Appendix C (Tables 46, 47, 48, and 49), only 22 percent of 194 institutions had formally adopted some policy regarding premarital pregnancy. Other statements simply amounted to insuring “consistent practice,” or something “agreed upon within the administration.” Those policies which were formulated were—in almost 50 percent of the instances—designed by the student personnel staff.

Usual consequences of premarital pregnancy ranged from removal from residence halls to suspension from the institution. Although no clear pattern developed, a majority of the responding institutions seemed to require a forced medical withdrawal or dismissal. The personnel staff, often in conjunction with the health service or conduct committees, most frequently handled these situations.

Required On-Campus Living

POLICY—Eighty-six percent of the institutions had policies dictating where a student could live (Table 21). The prevalent pattern (34 percent) was to require all students (except commuters) to live on the campus or in approved community housing. An additional seven percent of the institutions required only new students to live on the campus; upperclassmen were expected to live in either university facilities or in approved housing in the community. Thus, over 40 percent of the institutions stipulated where a student could live throughout his college career. Twenty-seven percent of the schools required freshmen to live on the campus and exempted upperclassmen from this requirement on the basis of age, grades, class, sex or parental approval. Otherwise, when a student reached a certain

TABLE 21
Policies Regarding Required On-Campus Living

Policy	Percent (N=153)
None	11
None, but concerned	3
Have policy, but did not state it	3
Policy categories:	
All students live on campus or in approved housing, with the exception of students living at home	34
All first-year students live on the campus (except commuters) and upperclassmen live in university or approved housing	7
All freshmen (except commuters) live on campus; upperclassmen may be exempted from on-campus living on the basis of age, grades, class, sex or parental approval	27
All freshmen (except commuters) live on the campus	7
All first-year females or those under 21 (except commuters) live on campus	8

age or achieved a particular class standing, he became eligible to live off-campus. Forty-two percent of the institutions either had no policy governing upperclass students, or had a plan for exempting them at some point prior to graduation. Essentially, all institutions that required on-campus living expected their new students to reside in university housing during the freshman year.

It should be pointed out that many institutions acknowledged exceptions to their policies when campus housing was filled, or when extenuating circumstances were involved, e.g. health or financial problems. Moreover, it was a common practice to permit students within commuting distance of the campus, or married students, to live in their own homes.

It would appear that the content of the policies was related to how a particular institution viewed its responsibility toward freshmen, women students, or undergraduate students in general. As already indicated, it was not uncommon to have special requirements for freshmen, women students and upperclass males less than 21 years of age. Freshmen might be expected to live on the campus, while upperclassmen were free to

select their own housing after the freshman year or at a specific age. In other cases, both freshmen and upperclass women might be required to reside on the campus. In some institutions, women might be exempted from the requirement at age 21, or when they achieved junior or senior status. To secure an exception to the policy, they might be asked to obtain parental approval.

Another approach was to stipulate that freshmen live in university residence halls but permit upperclassmen to reside in university-approved housing until graduation or until they reached a particular age. Some institutions stated that all students were required to live in university housing, but in reality, due to limitation of their residence hall facilities, exceptions were made to the policy on the basis of age or class standing. In these instances, policy seemed to be dictated by the availability of campus housing and the institutions' financial commitments on the residence halls. Other institutions, because of their isolated location and lack of community housing, had no choice but to provide housing for all of their students and to require that students live on the campus.

PURPOSE—Table 22 contains the data on the purposes of the policies.

TABLE 22
Purposes of Policies Regarding Required On-Campus Living

Purpose	Percent (N=154*)
Contribute to education of students	48
Control students and maintain standards	14
Fulfill financial commitments	23
Fulfill institutional responsibility for health and welfare of students	15

**N inflated by 35 combination responses.*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Ninety-one percent of the respondents who answered the question on how the policies were developed indicated that they were both formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). On-campus living was apparently considered an issue of sufficient importance and concern to both the institution and the students to demand formal action and organized communication.

The importance of the requirement also is evident when the data on the formulation process are examined (Table 47). The governing board was mentioned by 42 percent of the respondents, while the administrative council was checked by 24 percent. Two-thirds of the respondents, then, indicated that their policies had been developed by high-level bodies.

The personnel dean and his staff (including the housing office) in most institutions had the responsibility for enforcing the policy. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents stated that the personnel staff processed violations of the policy (Table 48).

As indicated in Table 49, the most common action taken when violations occurred was to require the student to move to the campus or into approved housing (47 percent). Dismissal was mentioned by 26 percent of the respondents; but dismissal, in most cases, would probably not result if the students complied with the policy after having been warned.

Recognition of Student Organizations

POLICY—Most of the institutions (93 percent) indicated that they had some type of policy pertaining to the recognition of student organizations (Table 23). The most frequently stated policy (38 percent) was that student organizations must have official approval of the student government and university officials as well as provide a list of officers, have a faculty adviser, and submit a constitution. Many of these institutions also

TABLE 23
Policies Regarding Recognition of Student Organizations

Policy	Percent (N=189)
None	5
None, but concerned	2
Have policy, but did not state it	11
Policy categories:	
Must have official approval of student government and university officials and provide membership lists, officers, advisers and a constitution	5
Same as above, with exception of membership lists	38
Must have official approval of student government and university officials only	24
Must have recognition of student government only and provide membership lists, officers, advisers and a constitution	2
Same as above, with exception of membership lists	6
Must have official recognition of student government only	7

stipulated that membership policies must be free of discrimination based on race, color or national origin. A few institutions indicated that organizations were required to submit membership lists. Those comprising the second highest response (24 percent) stated that only the approval of student government and university officials was necessary. A small number of institutions said that approval by student government was the only requirement.

PURPOSE—As recorded in Table 24, the reason most frequently (47 percent) given for institutional policy regarding student organizations was to maintain control and standards. This indicated that a substantial number of institutions set definite limitations within which student organizations must function. An additional 23 percent said that their policies were designed to provide orderly procedures for establishing and recognizing student organizations, rather than control. Nearly one-third of the institutions indicated that their policies were intended to encourage creative educational activities among students as well as student responsibility.

TABLE 24
Purposes of Policies Regarding
Recognition of Student Organizations

Purpose	Percent (N=174*)
Maintain control and standards	47
Maintain orderly procedures	23
To encourage educational ventures among students and student responsibility	30
<i>*N inflated by 20 combination responses.</i>	

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Most of the respondents (85 percent) revealed that their policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). Only eight percent said that their policies were simply an agreement within the administration or a matter of consistent practice.

Student/faculty/administrative committees were cited most frequently (34 percent) as being responsible for the formulation of policy (Table 47). One-third indicated that their policies were established by the administration; *i.e.*, by the governing board, administrative council or student personnel staff. Student government had the exclusive responsibility for the policies in 11 percent of the institutions. The "other" agents of policy

formulation cited were found to be primarily such groups as student/administrative committees, or the entire faculty. The evidence indicated that policies regarding student organizations were fairly well-formulated at most institutions, and that a variety of institutional constituents had played a role in policy formulation. It is apparent, therefore, that this area of student life had received considerable attention in most institutions.

According to the data in Table 48, members of the student personnel staffs were mentioned most frequently as those who processed violation of policy (48 percent). Students were involved in handling violations—via conduct committees—in 40 percent of the institutions. As noted above, committees seemed to play the dominant role in the matter of policy formulation, and this held true in the adjudication of policy violations as well.

It is impossible to pigeon-hole the consequences of violation policies on this issue. Most of the respondents said that they had no violations; if they did, usually some type of sanction would be levied against the organization in violation.

Women's Hours

POLICY—The variety of programs for women's hours seem, at first glance, to be limited only by the number of institutions themselves. In that the specific hours may be governed by local conditions, it was decided that more meaningful information could be provided by not attempting to cite all the varieties of programs. On the other hand, it seemed useful to know whether hours were on a graduated basis, or similar for all students. It was assumed that most institutions allowed different weekend hours and certain special permissions; neither case was considered in detail.

TABLE 25
Policy Regarding Women's Hours

Policy	Percent (N=189)
None	11
None, but concerned	2
Have policy, but did not state it	20
Policy categories:	
Specific hours on ungraduated basis for all women	26
Specific hours for all women on graduated basis (i. e., class, age, academic standing)	27
Graduated program of hours to include specific hours for some women and no hours for others	14

Of those member institutions responding to this item, 13 percent indicated they had no policy regarding women's hours. Except for two instances, these institutions are all male schools or have no women students residing on the campus.

Eighty seven percent of the institutions had a policy with regard to women's hours. When compared with the policy development on other issues, this figure is unusually high. Twenty percent had not stated their policies, twenty-six percent maintained specific and similar hours for all undergraduate women, but on a graduated basis; and the remaining 16 percent had a graduated program which included specific hours for some women and no hours for others.

The programs of specific and similar hours for all women most typically established weekday hours from 10:00 p.m. to 12 midnight, and weekend hours from 12:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. The specific hours imposed varied greatly and seemed dependent upon such conditions as whether the institution is located in an urban or rural setting.

PURPOSE—Table 26 outlines the purposes used by respondents to support their policies.

TABLE 26
Purposes of Policies Regarding Women's Hours

Purpose	Percent (N=153*)
Maintain campus standards and control	16
Maintain campus image	1
Protect women students and secure buildings	30
Allow for rest of students and staff	23
Meet parental expectations	14
To encourage individual responsibility and freedom	16
<i>*N inflated by 13 combination responses.</i>	

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—More specific information is listed in Table 46, but it is important to indicate that 95 percent of the respondents had formally adopted and systematically communicated their policy regarding women's hours. The figure clearly indicates the degree of attention given to this matter. The deans indicated that combined student/faculty/administrative committees were most often involved in the formulation of these policies (Table 47). Student legislative and judicial bodies were also occasionally involved.

When violations occurred, student committees acting with delegated responsibility or in conjunction with a personnel staff, handled the situations (Table 48). The usual consequences depended greatly upon the circumstances surrounding the cases, but most often amounted to limitation of privileges or probationary level actions (Table 49).

The question regarding purpose of the policy elicited such disturbing comments as: "Never really defined—unfortunately," "Women need protection from eager youths," "Good question!" "I suppose, to help girls develop a pattern for study;" "Presumably in responst to '*in loco parentis*' responsibility," and "Formulated in antiquity." Several respondents called for a re-thinking of the entire policy by a student/faculty/administrative committee.

POLICIES RELATED TO FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Invitation of Controversial Speakers to Campus

POLICY—As recorded in Table 27, 15 percent of the 189 respondents indicated that they did not have a policy pertaining to the invitation of controversial speakers to their campuses. Ten percent said that although they did not have a policy, they maintained an in-

TABLE 27
Policies Regarding Invitation
of Controversial Speakers to Campus

Policy	Percent (N=189)
None	15
None, but concerned	10
Have policy, but did not state it	6
Policy categories:	
Certain controversial speakers are not permitted	4
Speakers must be approved by an official or committee	31
All speakers permitted if certain guidelines are followed; e. g. having group sponsorship, registering in advance, maintaining a balance in the type of speakers invited, keeping programs orderly, insuring programs have educa- tional value	24
All speakers allowed	10

stitutional concern. Their responses to the question, "Under what circumstances would you take action?" fell into two categories. Some implied that they in fact did have a policy which was not formalized in writing. Most of these institutions required speaker approval by the administration. The others stated that their concern revolved around such matters as the potential educational value of speaker, danger of riots, advance preparations to arrange seminars and maximize educational benefits and efforts to present both sides of an issue. These institutions indicated that they might take administrative action if any of these concerns were violated. A few others said that they might be forced to establish a policy, or take action, if a speaker advocated the overthrow of the government or if the local community raised serious objections to his visit.

Three-fourths of the respondents said that their institutions had a policy regarding the invitation of controversial speakers. Generally speaking, more than half of the institutions required some type of clearance or approval of all speakers. A small number said specifically that certain types of speakers *would not* be permitted to appear on their campuses. For example, one person said that "no known communists may speak." About one-third implied that some speakers *might not* be permitted. The following comment is an example: "Speakers may be invited if they do not advocate that which is contrary to faith, morals or American democracy." Twenty-four percent said that all speakers would be allowed, and that prior approval was only for the purpose of insuring that certain procedures were carried out. An institution of this disposition stated: "Officially recognized student and faculty groups may invite any speakers they choose. We encourage them to provide for discussion of both sides of the issue involved." A few indicated that all speakers would be permitted to appear on their campuses, and made no mention of procedures or approval.

Most institutions seemed to follow fairly liberal policies. Although 31 percent said they required prior approval, many of them implied that very little censorship was exercised. Most of these institutions appeared to be concerned only about speakers who are exceptionally extreme or offensive. The majority of the respondents mentioned that invitations to speakers should come from officially recognized student groups, faculty members or staff. In other words, it was felt that the invitation should come from *within* the institution.

PURPOSE—Two of the typical statements on purpose, when combined, make up more than one-half of the total response to this item: 25 percent of the respondents alluded to the educational value of having a variety of speakers, and 27 percent said that allowing freedom of expression was the primary reason for their policies (Table 28). However, the policies at 12 percent of the institutions were established to maintain institutional standards and to exercise control over controversial speakers. One-quarter of the respondents said that their policies were intended only to insure observance of orderly procedures, and were not meant to restrict the invitation of speakers. A few institutions indicated a concern for the campus image necessitated a greater level of control. Others specified that those speakers who advocated violations of law or overthrow of the government

TABLE 28
Purposes of Policies Regarding the Invitation
of Controversial Speakers to Campus

Purpose	Percent (N=140*)
Achieve educational objectives	25
Protect campus image	4
Maintain standards and control	12
Maintain community law	4
Maintain orderly procedures	25
Protect students from extreme or harmful views	3
Allow freedom of expression	27
<i>*N inflated by 21 combination responses.</i>	

could not be permitted. Only a few respondents said directly that their policies were designed to protect students from extreme or harmful views. Many institutions did not state rationales for their policies.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—The data indicate that considerable attention had been directed toward formulation of policies pertaining to invitation of controversial speakers to the campus (Table 46). A large percentage (65 percent) of the respondents indicated that their policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated. Twenty-three percent said that their policies were established by administrative agreement or as an outgrowth of consistent practice.

The policies at most institutions were formulated administratively (Table 47). In over two-thirds of the institutions, they were established by either a governing board or an administrative council. In addition, most of the respondents who checked "other" on the questionnaire said that the president or some other administrative official had developed their policies. Sixteen percent indicated that their policies had been formulated by a student/faculty/administrative committee.

In close to two-thirds of the institutions, a member of the student personnel staff handled violations of policy related to the invitation of controversial speakers (Table 48). One-fourth of the institutions indicated that some type of conduct committee dealt with violations. Several said that the presidents of their institutions processed violations direct-

ly. (It should be noted that the percentages of the various responses to this question have limited significance, because 113 out of 194 respondents did not answer the question.

Most of the institutions either did not state a penalty for violations, or said that they had no violations. Of those who responded, about three quarters revealed that the persons or group in violation would be confronted with the violation, and that either a reprimand or some type of limitation of privileges would result (Table 49). Only two institutions mentioned suspension as a possible consequence.

Student Demonstrations

POLICY—The fact that 40 percent of the institutions in the sample did not have policies on student demonstrations might support the contention that many colleges and universities should give more attention to the problem (Table 29). Of the 60 percent that had policies, 39 percent permitted demonstrations without advanced registration or approval as long as they were orderly and did not interfere with normal institutional functions. Nearly all of the institutions with policies permitted demonstrations under various conditions, and in a few cases, without any restrictions.

TABLE 29
Policies Regarding Student Demonstrations

Policy	Percent (N=153)
None	25
None, but concerned	15
Have policy, but did not state it	3
Policy categories:	
Do not permit demonstrations	3
Permit them with advanced registration or consultation, if orderly	6
Permit them without advanced registration, if orderly	39
Restricts them to outside of buildings, if orderly	1
Permit them, consistent with local law	3
Permit them, without restrictions	5

Although most institutions having demonstration policies did not require prior approval, some schools expected students to consult with administrative personnel or to register the activity with a campus official in advance of the event. In some cases, the concurrence of an adviser or university official was necessary before the demonstration could be conducted. Consultation, approval, or registration was required to make sure that students observed campus regulations and that institutional functions were not disrupted.

Some schools specified that students had the right to protest, but that demonstrations must be held at certain times and locations with controlled use of loudspeaker equipment. Other institutions did not attempt to prescribe such details, but rather stipulated that students should behave in a responsible manner and should not interfere with the rights and privileges of others. A few required only that students observe the law and be ready to accept the legal consequences of their actions. Moreover, in some schools, demonstrations were covered under a general conduct statement; students were expected simply to conduct themselves in a responsible manner and to respect the basic educational goals and standards of the institution.

Some institutional representatives stated that disciplinary action would be taken when demonstrations were disorderly and that students must differentiate between acceptable and unacceptable forms of protest. Students were told that if their actions violated the rights of others or interfered with the normal processes of the institution, penalties would be imposed that could include dismissal.

A few institutional policies contained statements regarding demonstrations in the community. These statements recognized the right of students to demonstrate on the campus in an acceptable manner. The institutions, however, did not attempt to regulate the off-campus demonstrations by students, unless they spoke or acted in the name of the college or one of its groups.

PURPOSE—The data on the purposes of the policies are presented in Table 30. The two most common purposes were to permit freedom of expression (43 percent) and to maintain the objectives, philosophy and educational functions of the institution (40 percent). A very small number of the institutions related their purpose directly to control of behavior; undoubtedly, however, some concern for control is reflected in any stated desire to maintain institutional objectives and philosophy.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Fifty-eight percent of the respondents stated that their policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). As recorded in Table 47, the most frequently mentioned policy development bodies were a student/faculty/administrative committee (26 percent) or an administrative council (21 percent). Only 16 percent of the respondents stated that the student personnel staff was responsible for the formulation of the policy; the governing board was mentioned by only nine percent.

According to over one-half of the respondents, the personnel dean or staff was responsible for processing violations of the policy (Table 48). Thirty-eight percent of the representatives stated that an institutional conduct committee, or a student committee, or a

TABLE 30
Purposes of Policies Regarding Student Demonstrations

Purpose	Percent (N=67*)
Maintain institutional objectives, philosophy and educational process	40
Maintain behavioral standards and desirable campus climate	3
Consider demonstrations an appropriate means of expression	6
Permit freedom of expression	43
Provide learning experiences	6
Support community law	2
<i>*N inflated by 13 combination responses.</i>	

combination of these two bodies acted when infractions occurred. In only a few institutions were students permitted to deal with violations without the assistance of an institutional conduct committee.

In 42 percent of the institutions answering the question on penalties used, action taken would depend on the nature of each case (Table 49). Thirty-seven percent employed sanctions less than dismissal in severity, but 21 percent did dismiss students who violated the policy.

Responsibility of Student Publications to the College Administration or Faculty

POLICY—The data in Table 31 indicate that 28 percent of the institutions did not have a policy that required student publications to be responsible to the administration or faculty. An additional 16 percent said that although they did not have a policy, there was an institutional concern. In most cases, these institutions stated that action might be taken if a publication printed obscene or slanderous material. The impression derived from the comments made by these institutions was that the absence of a formal policy did not represent a disposition toward complete freedom. In practice, they seemed to adhere to a policy which prohibited certain kinds of material from being published. A few institutions indicated that they were concerned only that the financial aspect of the publications be handled responsibly.

TABLE 31
Policies Regarding the Responsibility
of Student Publications to the College Administration or Faculty

Policy	Percent (N=152)
None	28
None, but concerned	16
Have policy, but did not state it	4
Policy categories:	
Content of publications must be cleared by a board or official prior to publication	3
All publications have broad responsibility to a board and/or code of standards	31
Restricted by journalistic standards only	13
Publications are under the jurisdiction of an academic department	3
No institutional control	2

Only three percent specifically stated that the content of their publications had to be cleared prior to publication. The prevalent policy statement (31 percent) was that all publications were responsible to a board and/or a code of standards, without the exercise of censorship prior to publication. Thirteen percent said that their publications were expected only to follow the same journalistic standards observed by the public press. In several institutions, publications were under the jurisdiction of the English or journalism departments and functioned as a laboratory experience for the students. A few institutions simply stated that they exerted no institutional control. The conclusion that can be drawn from the data is that although very little control or censorship was exercised, almost all institutions maintained some supervision of student publications by requiring them to be responsible to either an administrative or faculty body.

PURPOSE—As shown in Table 32, most of the institutions (105 of 154) did not give a rationale for their policies. Seventeen percent of the respondents said that their policies were based on a concern for protecting the image of the institutions. Twenty percent indicated that their policies were designed to maintain campus standards and control of

TABLE 32
**Purposes of Policies Regarding Responsibility
 of Student Publications to the College Administration or Faculty**

Purpose	Percent (N=57*)
Maintain campus image	17
Protect the rights and feelings of others	2
Maintain standards and control	20
Teach the exercise of freedom and responsibility	44
Provide freedom of expression	15
Support community law	2
<i>*N inflated by 4 combination responses.</i>	

student publications. Slightly less than one-half stated that their non-restrictive policies were necessary to teach students the proper exercise of freedom and responsibility. An additional 15 percent said that their policies were intended to provide for freedom of expression. A few institutions mentioned that their policies were based on the need to support community law regarding slander and to protect the rights and feelings of other students.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Nearly two-thirds of the institutions indicated that their policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). Because only 91 out of 154 institutions responded to the question on policy formulation, the percentages of responses have limited significance and only the most common response is cited.

According to Table 47, in almost one-half of the institutions, the policies on student publications were formed administratively: *i.e.*, by a governing board (18 percent), an administrative council (26 percent) or the student personnel staff (three percent). Twenty-eight percent indicated that a student/faculty/administrative committee formulated their policies. In none of the institutions did the students have the sole authority for establishing policy regarding student publications. Again, the percentages cited are limited by the fact that only 96 out of 154 institutions responded to this question.

Most of the institutions either said that they had no violations, or failed to respond to the question. Of the institutions that responded, about three-fourths said that violations were handled by some type of conduct committee (Table 48). Twenty percent indicated

that a member of the personnel staff processed violations, and a few said that the presidents of their institutions dealt with infractions directly.

Although most institutions either said that they had no violations or did not respond to the question, 61 percent said that if there were a violation, there would be a discussion with those responsible for the publication (Table 49). Fifteen percent indicated that a violation would result in either a reprimand or some curtailment of the publication. About one-fourth said that the consequences would depend upon the situation. None of the institutions mentioned suspension or dismissal as a possible consequence. Clearly the implication is that student publications are not seen as a serious problem in most institutions.

POLICIES RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE-FACULTY PRACTICES BEARING ON STUDENT WELFARE

Faculty Drinking with Students

POLICY—The highest (60 percent) portion of “no policy” responses was received on the issue of faculty drinking with students (Table 33). About one-fourth of the responses were tempered by an acknowledgement of concern, even though there was no policy. Most of these said that student/faculty drinking was permitted within certain limitations, and that action would be taken by the institution only if it became a problem. For example, several respondents indicated that they would act in cases where it became embarrassing to, or cast a bad reflection upon, the school; when bad conduct resulted,

TABLE 33
Policies Regarding Faculty Drinking with Students

Policy	Percent (N=188)
None	46
None, but concerned	14
Have policy, but did not state it	3
Policy categories:	
Prohibited	12
Prohibited on campus	5
Discouraged, but not prohibited	3
Permitted, but must maintain law and good conduct	12
No concern unless a complaint is made	5

especially involvement with civil authorities; when a state law or a regulation against on-campus drinking was violated; when little discretion was used; or when the behavior seemed to be damaging to student-faculty relationships.

Seventeen percent of the institutions indicated that they had a policy prohibiting student/faculty drinking. An additional 17 percent said that it was permitted within certain conditions—primarily the observance of law and good conduct—or that the institution had no concern unless a complaint was made.

PURPOSE—The data in Table 34 show that a very small portion (42 out of 194) of the total sample indicated rationales for their policies. In addition to the fact that few institutions had a policy, others apparently assumed the rationale was obvious. A number of comments, like the following, give this impression: "This is simply a matter of consistent practice and is understood without any need for a stated policy as such." The most fre-

TABLE 34
Purposes of Policies Regarding
Faculty Drinking with Students

Purpose	Percent (N=47*)
Maintain campus image	15
Maintain standards and control	22
Maintain professional stature of the faculty	9
Maintain community law	20
Permit, to allow the development of responsibility	4
Prohibit, since practice is not consistent with the educational values and objectives of the school	30

**N inflated by 5 combination responses.*

quent response (30 percent) cited was that student/faculty drinking was inconsistent with the educational values and objectives of the institution. Other stated purposes that received support were maintenance of campus standards and image and community law and protection of the professional stature of the faculty. A few institutions which favored student/faculty drinking specifically mentioned that this should be encouraged as a means of building student-faculty rapport. The following comment is an example: "It is one of the better ways to establish rapport and should be judiciously encouraged."

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—As one would expect (having observed that the majority of institutions do not have policies relating to student/faculty drinking) few schools responded to the question on method of policy formulation. Confusingly enough, however, 41 percent of the respondents said that their policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated (Table 46). It is not surprising that another 46 percent said that their policies were not formally adopted, and that they were either simply agreed upon with the administration or were a matter of consistent practice.

As shown in Table 47, 58 percent of the limited number (51) of representatives who responded to the question indicated that their policies were formulated administratively by a governing board (32 percent), an administrative council (26 percent) or a member of the student personnel staff (one percent). Of the 34 percent who indicated some "other" person or group, besides those listed on the instrument, most referred to the president or some other administrative official as the source of the policy. It is therefore apparent that, generally, policy on this matter was established by administrative action.

Forty percent of the respondents revealed that violations were handled by a member of their student personnel staff (Table 48). The president (23 percent), civil authorities (six percent) and the academic dean (19 percent) were also mentioned as persons involved in handling violations.

The categories of consequences of violations were not appropriate for this particular issue. However, of the few who responded to the question concerning what the possible consequences might be, most said that the faculty would simply be asked to discontinue the behavior in question. A few institutions that forbade the use of alcohol by both faculty and students indicated that the former would be fired and the latter suspended.

Provision of Contraceptives

POLICY—The response from member institutions regarding provision of contraceptives indicated that few had given much attention to the establishment of policies regarding this matter (Table 35). Sixty percent reported "no policy," although 13 percent acknowledged some institutional concern. A number of the institutions without a policy statement indicated that if the question should arise, they would be unalterably opposed to such provision. A few stated that the matter was under study at this time.

Only 10 percent of all respondents would, in certain circumstances, provide contraceptives: to married students; to individual medical cases handled by university doctors as privileged patients; or to students under conditions such as detailed in the following statement:

Contraceptives are provided only at the request of the student's family physician, with verification by the college physician.

Only one institution made a practice of issuing contraceptives upon request. It is difficult to provide a variety of statements to illustrate the stance of institutions which, as a matter of policy, do not provide contraceptives. Most respondents simply offered the university position without elaboration. The church-related, especially the Catholic institutions, provided a notable exception—as illustrated by the following statement:

TABLE 35
Policy Regarding the Provision of Contraceptives

Policy	Percent (N=190)
None	47
None, but concerned	13
Policy categories:	
Do not provide contraceptives	24
Do not provide contraceptives, except to married students and special medical cases	5
Do not provide contraceptives, but provide information and counsel regarding them	3
Do not provide contraceptives, but provide referral sources	3
Does provide contraceptives upon request	1
Respect judgment of medical authorities; prescribe when necessary	4

The use of contraceptives is against the moral law and the Commandments of God. Our policy which precludes the issuing of contraceptives enables us to conform to the ideals and objectives of the University. The policy has already been formulated by divine law.

PURPOSE—Only 51 institutions gave some indication of the purpose for their policies regarding the provision of contraceptives.

Nearly one-half of the respondents considered this issue to be a personal medical matter in which the university should not assume responsibility, and another 29 percent indicated their decision not to provide contraceptives was consistent with the moral code of the institution.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Very few responses were recorded for the other facets of this question. Any policy statements tended to be simply a matter of consistent practice, as opposed to formal adoption of a statement (Table 46). Health service personnel and student personnel staff were the university agents most actively involved in policy development (Table 47). Questions about violations and usual consequences were not applicable.

Use of Student Records

POLICY – There seemed to be some difficulty on the part of respondents in understanding the nature of the question pertaining to policy regarding student records. Perhaps the question was not well stated. In any event, most of those completing the questionnaire answered it in terms of the release of records to persons or agencies *outside* the institution, rather than use of records within the institution. Close to two-thirds of the institutions, as indicated in Table 37, did not have a policy regarding the use of student records; 18

TABLE 37
Policies Regarding Use of Student Records

Policy	Percent (N=150)
None	42
None, but concerned	18
Has policy, but did not state it	1
Policy categories:	
Release no information to outside authorities except academic transcripts (with student's permission)	18
Release information only at request of student	14
Release information to governmental agencies, courts and other schools without the consent of the student (except specific confidential information)	4
Releases information to all outside agencies without student's approval (except specific confidential information)	1
Allows students to see only their own academic records	1
Allows students to see their own academic records and portions of their personal records	1

percent, however, said that they maintained an institutional concern in this matter. The concern most frequently expressed related to the confidential nature of such materials, and to their release only to authorized persons and *with* student consent.

Eighteen percent of the institutions said that they had a policy which prohibited the release of information to outside authorities, with the exception of academic transcripts when requested by the students. Fourteen percent said that they would release information in addition to the transcript if requested by the student. Only four percent revealed that they would release information (with exception of specific confidential material) to government agencies, courts, or other educational institutions without the consent of the student. Only seven institutions would release information (with the exception of specific confidential material) to all outside agencies, without the consent of the student.

The data illustrate clearly that most institutions had not found it necessary to establish definite policies pertaining to the use of student records. The majority of institutions, however, appeared to exercise considerable caution in releasing information, and usually did so only with the consent of the student.

PURPOSE – According to Table 38, nearly all of the institutions viewed the safeguarding of students' right to privacy and the maintenance of confidentiality as the bases for their policies. A few schools mentioned a concern for the legal protection of the institution and professional ethics in handling student records.

TABLE 38
Purposes of Policies
Regarding Use of Student Records

Purpose	Percent (N=125*)
Maintain student's right to privacy and confidentiality	93
Maintain legal protection of the institution	3
Maintain practice consistent with professional ethics	4

**N inflated by 18 combination responses*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION – Generally speaking, slightly less than one-half of the institutions responding had formally adopted policies regarding the use of student records (Table 46). Only 39 percent had policies that were both formally adopted and systematically communicated. An additional six percent had formal policies but did not systematically communicate them. However, it is evident that those institutions without formal policies followed certain procedures with reasonable consistency. Twelve percent indicated that their policies had been systematically communicated within their institutions, although the policies were not formally stated. Twenty-one percent said that their policies were developed by administrative agreement, and 17 percent indicated that their policies evolved through consistent practice.

As recorded in Table 47, in three-quarters of the institutions, policies regarding the use of student records were formulated by a member of the student personnel staff (34 percent), an administrative group such as a governing board (seven percent) or an administrative council (33 percent). Seven percent said that their policies were established by a faculty-administrative committee. A few indicated that a student/faculty/administrative committee formulated their policies, but in none of the institutions was policy making regarding student records entirely in the hands of the students. The remainder specified a variety of other policy sources – the president, a state education code, the entire faculty, the registrar or professional associations.

Table 48 illustrates that in nearly all of the institutions, violations of policy relating to student records were dealt with administratively by a personnel dean (60 percent), academic dean (20 percent) or the president (13 percent). This was to be expected, in light of the fact that most violations relating to student records would be committed by staff members and not students. Two institutions said that violations would be processed by a conduct committee, and three said that civil authorities could be involved in investigating violations. Because very few institutions responded to this question, the results are not very meaningful.

Use of Students as Research Subjects

POLICY—The results in Table 39 indicate that use of students as research subjects has presented very few problems on most campuses, and that policy formulation on this matter has received little attention. Seventy-eight percent of the institutions said that they had not established a policy relating to this subject; furthermore, 42 percent felt that it was unnecessary to have a policy. Eighteen percent said that although they did not have a policy, they were concerned lest such practice interfere with students' academic work and endanger their health and safety. An additional 18 percent indicated that they had no formal policy, but specifically stated that they would take measures to prevent exploitation or infringement upon the privacy of students. Of special concern was the involvement of students without their knowledge or consent.

Fourteen percent of the respondents revealed that they maintained a policy regarding all research projects to be approved by a university official or committee. Many of these institutions also mentioned that all research permitted had to have some educational significance, and had to be directly beneficial to the institutions. Five percent mentioned only that students at their institutions must agree to participate voluntarily. One institutional policy singled out "educational value" as the only criterion for permitting research using students, and one institution simply stated that the use of students as research subjects was not permitted.

PURPOSE—According to the data in Table 40, only 28 institutions stated a rationale for their policies. Most of the respondents indicated that concern for the protection of students was the basis for their policies. The remainder cited legal protection for the institution as their primary purpose.

TABLE 39
Policies Regarding Use of Students
as Research Subjects

Policy	Percent (N=149)
None	42
None, but concerned	18
Has policy, but did not state it	1
Policy categories:	
No policy, but do not permit exploitation of students or loss of privacy	18
Permit with approval by university official or committee	14
Allow students to participate on voluntary basis	5
Permit if research has educational value	1
Use of students not permitted	1

TABLE 40
Purposes of Policies Regarding Use
of Students as Research Subjects

Purpose	Percent (N=28)
Protect student	86
Protect institution from legal action	14

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—Because only 34 of 154 institutions responded to the question on policy formulation, the results are of little value (Table 46). Of those who did respond, only ten institutions indicated that their policies were formally adopted. Thirty-six percent said that their policies were, in effect, a matter of consistent practice.

Only 29 institutions answered the question on who formulated the policy (Table 47). Sixteen institutions (55 percent) indicated that their policies were developed administratively. A few respondents said that their policies were formulated by committees composed of students, faculty and administrators while several indicated that some other office or individual—such as the office of research or the president—was responsible for policy establishment.

Of the few (21) institutions that responded, 85 percent said that either the personnel dean or academic dean handled violations of policy (Table 48). Most of the respondents, however, said that no violations had occurred. The question pertaining to consequences of policy violations was not appropriate to this issue.

IMPORTANCE OF THE ISSUES TO THE INSTITUTIONS

In order to gain some sense of the degree to which the various campuses are genuinely concerned over the issues dealt with in this study, respondents were asked to rank the issues "in order of significance." An average rank was computed for each issue, and on the basis of this average, the 18 items were ordered from the lowest to the highest mean. Thus, those issues with the lowest numerical value are considered most important (Table 50).

In interpreting these data, great significance should not be attached to the precise position of the issues on the scale. The respondents were forced to rank the topics, 1 through 18, and they were not given an opportunity to explain, for example, that some or many issues were equal, or nearly equal, in importance. Many respondents complained that they could not really distinguish between certain issues in terms of their degree of significance. The researchers have concluded that it would have been better to ask the respondents to group the issues into categories such as "very important," "moderately important," and "not important." The rankings, however, still have some value if one asks whether a certain issue falls in the upper, middle or lower ranges of the scale.

Excessive use of alcohol, off-campus misconduct, women's hours, student dress and appearance, financial irresponsibility and required on-campus living were ranked in the top one-third; these issues, plus student publications, drugs and deviant sexual behavior were ranked in the upper one-half.

As indicated in Table 41, when the significance of the issues is examined in terms of the *frequency* with which they were ranked from one through six only, no change in position is noted among the top seven issues. The nine issues ranked in the top half on the basis of significance also remain in the upper half on the basis of frequency of mention. There were some changes in relative position in the lower half of the scale, but they were not marked. Student records, for example, moved from 15 to 13, while student demonstrations moved from 13 to 15. Such changes did not seem to be of particular importance.

TABLE 41
Frequency with Which Issues Were Ranked in the Upper One-Third

Issue	Percentage Rspns. Positions 1-6	Rank In Order Freq. Positions 1-6	Avg. Rank Among All 18 Issues	Avg. Rank Order for All 18 Issues	Number Responding*
Excessive Use of Alcohol	70.3	1	3.33	1	295
Off-Campus Misconduct	51.8	2	5.67	2	276
Women's Hours	44.5	3	6.44	3	260
Dress and Appearance	44.3	4	6.59	4	274
Financial Irresponsibility	38.4	5	7.08	5	265
Required On-Campus Living	34.7	6	7.55	6	254
Student Publications	31.8	7	7.87	7	255
Deviant Sexual Behavior	26.9	8	8.30	9	243
Drugs	26.8	9	8.02	8	254
Entertainment Residence Hall Bedrooms	23.5	10	9.21	11	246
Premarital Pregnancy	22.4	11	8.94	10	241
Recognition of Student Organizations	21.4	12	9.47	12	246
Student Records	19.7	13	10.35	15	251
Controversial Speakers	18.8	14	10.00	14	245
Student Demonstrations	18.0	15	9.98	13	245
Faculty-Student Drinking	8.7	16	12.69	16	238
Use of Students as Research Subjects	5.8	17	13.87	18	242
Provision of Contraceptives	4.1	18	13.48	17	224

*The sample size was 348 since both forms A and B of the questionnaire contained the same item on ranking of the issues.

The issues which were of greatest concern to the respondents were, for the most part, related to the control of student behavior. It is probably not surprising that student personnel administrators viewed the issues in this way, since administrators are so often responsible for enforcement of regulations and processing of violations. Yet, these issues were probably recorded as being significant for reasons other than merely the respondents' personal perceptions or over-reactions to particular problems. For example, on many campuses the use of alcohol and drugs, women's hours, dress and appearance, required on-campus living, off-campus misconduct and financial irresponsibility are uppermost in the minds of students, faculty, parents and administrators alike. They might all view the issues differently and recommend widely divergent solutions, but they are concerned with the same problems. Such issues, moreover, are related to limiting freedom of action, and when the control of freedom is involved, it is natural that conflict will result.

The respondents did not feel that controversial speakers and student demonstrations were very important issues. On the other hand, student publications were felt to be a significant source of difficulty to many deans. One can only speculate why these three issues involving freedom of expression were viewed so differently. One possible explanation is that publications—especially campus newspapers—are continuing student activities which are an integral part of most campuses, and that therefore, there is simply a greater chance for them to become a source of difficulty. The administration may frequently be the target of unhappy editors; the appearance of controversial speakers on campus, and student demonstrations, are not everyday happenings, (and in fact are probably very infrequent occurrences).

Faculty-student drinking, use of students as research subjects and issuance of contraceptives were not considered major campus problems. The insignificance of the first two problems is not surprising; but in view of the pronouncements of the so-called "new left" and coverage in the public press, it would seem that provision of contraceptives might have emerged as a more important issue. It is possible too, of course, that it is seen as an issue by some students, but that their concern is not shared by administrators.

The respondents also were asked to indicate other issues involving institutional policy which have been of major concern from the point of view of the dean of students. Many respondents did not record additional issues. Those who did, most frequently mentioned problems related to student misconduct or the control of student behavior. The next most frequently mentioned area was student involvement in decision-making.

COMPARISON AMONG INSTITUTIONS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF POLICY FORMULATION

Hypothesis I.

Hypothesis I was concerned with identifying differences among institutions of different types with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the 18 issues. Although many categories were included in this general hypothesis, each individual item was treated separately in the analysis.

TABLE 42
Interinstitutional Comparisons (By Type, Size, Percentage
of Student Body Living on Campus and Region) With Regard
to the Degree of Policy Formulation on the Eighteen Topics

Variable	Type (d.f.=14)		Size (d.f.=4)		%Student Body Living on Campus (d.f.=6)		Region (d.f.=6)	
	X ²	P	X ²	P	X ²	P	X ²	P
Controversial Speakers	18.23	NS	6.86	NS	3.65	NS	22.89	*
Deviant Sex Behavior	21.39	NS	6.81	NS	9.38	NS	5.51	NS
Dress and Appearance	21.90	NS	7.58	NS	5.35	NS	4.96	NS
Drugs	22.59	NS	2.45	NS	3.81	NS	7.14	NS
Entertainment in Residence Hall Bedrooms	14.05	NS	4.07	NS	(not calculated)		6.92	NS
Excessive Use of Alcohol	11.03	NS	4.22	NS	6.72	NS	19.41	*
Faculty-Student Drinking	27.19	*	9.66	*	5.32	NS	5.36	NS
Financial Irresponsibility	18.20	NS	5.54	NS	6.71	NS	5.81	NS
Off-Campus Misconduct	(not calculated)		11.39	*	10.06	NS	3.99	NS
Premarital Pregnancy	18.05	NS	6.04	NS	13.95	*	13.77	*
Provision of Contraceptives	14.17	NS	2.82	NS	4.48	NS	13.84	*
Recognition of Student Organizations	12.74	NS	6.17	NS	1.84	NS	8.88	NS
Required on-Campus Living	14.79	NS	6.56	NS	(not calculated)		10.78	NS
Student Demonstrations	21.33	NS	35.83	*	8.34	NS	8.86	NS
Student Publications	10.79	NS	5.79	NS	4.00	NS	6.69	NS
Student Records	21.34	NS	5.22	NS	4.00	NS	4.71	NS
Use of Students as Research Subjects	12.90	NS	6.86	NS	2.78	NS	1.81	NS
Women's Hours	32.64	*	3.49	NS	8.20	NS	13.40	*

NS-Not Significant

*Significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence

It was not possible to accept or reject the null hypothesis* in its entirety. The data in Table 42 reveal that no differences existed among institutions of different types in the degree of policy formulation on any of 18 issues except women's hours and faculty/student drinking. The difference among institutions with regard to women's hours is statistically significant, but irrelevant in view of the fact that except in two instances, all the institutions that indicated no concern for women's hours have no female students enrolled or living on campus. The difference simply indicates that a high percentage of the institutions which have no female students enrolled or living on campus are church-related. With regard to faculty/student drinking, there was less policy formulation in public institutions than would perhaps have been predicted; more in church-related

*Null hypotheses are stated on page 8.

institutions. In that the policies regarding faculty/student drinking tended to discourage or prohibit such behavior, it is safe to assume that church-related institutions are more concerned about the problem than are other institutions.

Hypothesis II.

Hypothesis II was concerned with identifying differences among the institutions of less than 1,500 students, of 1,500 - 5,000 students, and of more than 5,000 students, with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the 18 issues.

Analysis of the individual variables as reported in Table 42 reveals that differences existed among institutions of different sizes in the degree of policy formulation only with regard to off-campus misconduct, faculty/student drinking and student demonstrations. The smaller institutions were more concerned about off-campus misconduct of students and had a greater degree of policy formulation than the larger institutions. More institutions of over 5,000 enrollment stated that they had no policy and should not give attention to this matter. Likewise, more policies were developed among the smaller institutions to regulate faculty/student drinking. The institutions with over 5,000 students have given more attention to the formulation of student demonstration policies.

Hypothesis III.

Hypothesis III was concerned with identifying differences among institutions having different percentages of the student body living on campus with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the 18 issues.

The data in Table 42 indicate that no differences existed among institutions having different percentages of the student body living on campus with regard to the degree of policy formulation, except in the case of premarital pregnancy. Institutions having fewer students residing on the campus had given less attention to this matter. A higher percentage of institutions with fewer than 33 percent of their students living on campus had no policy and felt that their institutions need not develop one. Certainly, fewer cases of premarital pregnancy come to the attention of campus authorities when fewer students reside on campus.

Expected differences were also noted with regard to required on-campus living and entertainment of the opposite sex in residence hall bedrooms. The distributions, however, did not allow for the Chi-square test to be utilized.

Hypothesis IV.

Hypothesis IV was concerned with identifying differences among the institutions from New England or Middle States, the Southern, North Central and Western regions with regard to the degree of policy formulation on each of the 18 issues.

As recorded in Table 42, analysis of the individual variables reveals that differences existed among institutions from the four regions with regard to five of the 18 issues:

Premarital pregnancy, women's hours, provision of contraceptives, controversial speakers and excessive use of alcohol.

Less attention was given in the New England and Middle States and Southern regions to the formulation of campus policies on excessive use of alcohol, and more stress was placed on this matter in the North Central and Western areas. Institutions in the New England or Middle States also expressed less concern for and evidenced less formulation of policies controlling women's hours. The North Central region again expressed most concern for this policy. The New England or Middle States and the Western regions were less inclined to develop institutional policies or express concern for policies to handle premarital pregnancy. The North Central and Southern regions placed more emphasis on policy development regarding this matter. More institutions in the Southern region stated no concern for the formulation of policies regarding controversial speakers, whereas the Western institutions had developed policy to a greater degree than the other regions. Likewise, Western schools gave the most attention to the formulation of policy regarding use of contraceptives. The Southern area evidenced a higher degree of unconcern on the matter than was noted in the other regions.

Summary and Implications

The purpose of the inquiry was to gather base-line data on the degree of policy formulation on 18 controversial topics in NASPA member institutions. In addition, the study was designed to gain information about the nature and purposes of the policies, the formulation and implementation processes and the significance of the issues on the campuses. An effort also was made to identify differences among institutions with reference to the extent of policy development on the 18 issues.

The study was designed to secure a variety of descriptive data on a wide range of issues as quickly as possible. A central concern was to produce data that would be relevant and useful to practicing student personnel administrators in coping with critical issues in an intelligent manner. It must be stated clearly that the intent of the study was not to provide comprehensive and normative data but rather to gain a degree of understanding of institutional approaches to the issues in sufficient depth to form a basis for wise action. Moreover, it was hoped that the investigation might reveal facets of the issues on which more intensive research might be conducted.

Members of the division identified issues for study which seemed to be current and troublesome to practicing administrators and on which general knowledge of institutional policies and practices was somewhat limited. The 18 topics selected were: controversial speakers, deviant sexual behavior, drugs, dress and appearance, entertainment of members of the opposite sex in residence hall bedrooms, excessive use of alcohol, faculty-student drinking, financial irresponsibility, off-campus misconduct, premarital pregnancy, provision of contraceptives, recognition of student organizations, required on-campus living, student demonstrations, student publications, student records, use of students as research subjects, and women's hours.

The data for the inquiry were gathered by a questionnaire developed by the members of the division. The questionnaire was designed to secure data on unwritten policies as well as those that had been formally established.

The 18 topics were divided equally between two forms of the questionnaire, and one half of the members received one form and the remaining half were given the alternate form. The instruments were mailed to 457 NASPA institutions, and 348 institutions or 76 percent completed the questionnaire.

Null hypotheses were formulated to test the differences pertaining to the degree of policy formulation as related to institutional size, type, location, and the percentage of students living on the various campuses. Chi-square was the statistical technique used, and the .05 level of significance was employed as the criterion to reject the null hypotheses.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Policies Related to the Eighteen Issues

Deviant Sexual Behavior—This problem was treated as a health or counseling problem in a relatively small number of institutions. The common pattern was to view the problem in terms of control and discipline. Sixty percent of the institutions had policies but less than one quarter had policies that were formally adopted and systematically communicated. The personnel staff and administrative councils played a prominent role in the development of the policies, which were intended to control student behavior. The personnel dean and his staff most commonly dealt with violations along with conduct committees, and violations most frequently resulted in disciplinary action.

Dress and Appearance—Two-thirds of the institutions had some type of policy on dress and appearance, and 41 percent of these institutions had prescribed dress codes. Three-quarters of the responding institutions had formally adopted policies. Policies on dress and appearance were most often developed by student committees or committees made up of representatives of the academic community. The most commonly stated purposes for the policies were related to order and control and to the development of a desirable campus atmosphere. The personnel staff most frequently processed dress problems, but student participation in the discipline process was mentioned by nearly one half of the respondents. The penalties when violations occurred were in the lower ranges of severity and did not include dismissal.

Drugs—Although the majority of respondents indicated concern for the handling of this issue, only 41 percent stated that their institution had an established policy regarding this matter, and only 32 percent had formally adopted the policies. The policy stated most often enabled the institution to treat abuse of drugs internally as much as possible through regular disciplinary channels. Most of the institutions recorded that the purpose of their policy was to maintain campus standards, control, or institutional values or to protect students from harm. Usual disciplinary actions were rather severe.

Entertainment of Members of the Opposite Sex in Residence Hall Bedrooms—Most of the institutions had policies on visitation, and nearly one-half of the schools prohibited the activity. Only a small percentage of the sample allowed the activity on a regular basis. The policies were developed by officially established and important decision-making bodies with limited student involvement and were, for the most part, formally adopted and systematically communicated. The two most prominent purposes of the policies were to maintain behavioral standards and to support educational goals and principles. The personnel dean and staff had a major role in processing violations along with conduct committees, which included students. The most common pattern was to treat violations with penalties of less than suspension.

Excessive Use of Alcoholic Beverages—Most institutions had a policy on excessive consumption of alcohol. The policies reflected an effort to restrict the use of alcohol and were intended to control behavior. Generally, the policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated and were established by official decision-making bodies. The

personnel dean and staff along with conduct committees most frequently processed infractions. The penalties used were usually less than suspension or the institution acted on the merits of each case.

Financial Irresponsibility—Eighty-three percent of the respondents stated that their institution had an established policy concerning this matter. In most cases, personnel in the dean of students office or the business office handled violations, and the usual response was to bar future registration or to withhold grades, transcripts, or graduation records.

Off-Campus Misconduct—Eighty-two percent of the respondents indicated that their institution had a policy with regard to unacceptable off-campus behavior. The largest block of institutions accepted responsibility for student behavior off-campus and used either a general conduct statement or a specific regulation dealing with off-campus behavior as a basis for action. At the same time, a number of schools suggested that the institution should be involved in off-campus affairs only when student behavior was detrimental to the welfare of the institution or when requested by civil authorities to act.

Although a relatively high percentage of respondents recorded policies regarding unacceptable off-campus behavior, there was a surprising lack of specificity in institutional expectations and of clear guidelines for processing violations.

Premarital Pregnancy—Only 50 percent of the institutions had a policy regarding premarital pregnancy, and only 17 of the 194 institutions had formally adopted some policy regarding this matter. Those few institutions which provided some rationale for their policy tended to be most concerned about campus standards and student values and only secondarily about the welfare of individual students. It was common for the problem to be treated outside the normal channels for disciplinary matters and to be handled in a counseling context. Parents often were consulted when the woman student was under 21 years of age. Depending upon the circumstances of the case (i. e., time in semester, parental reaction, and distance from home to school) the girl might be asked to leave the institution. Medical withdrawals were encouraged for advanced stages of pregnancy.

Required On-Campus Living—Most of the institutions required some portion of their student population to live on the campus. Virtually all institutions with housing programs expected freshmen (non-commuters) to reside in institutional housing, and 41 percent of the institutions controlled where a student could live during his entire educational career. In most cases, the policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated, and were developed by high-level governing or administrative bodies. The most prominently stated purposes of the policies were related to the educational mission and financial commitments of the institution. The personnel dean and his staff were responsible most frequently for processing violations, and the standard action was to require students to change their residence to comply with the policy.

Student Organizations—Nearly all of the institutions had policies regarding student organizations, and most of these institutions had policies requiring the official approval of all student organizations. Although they varied with regard to the specific conditions for approval, most institutions required student organizations to have a faculty adviser and to

provide a list of officers and a constitution. Very few schools requested a list of members from prospective organizations. At a limited number of institutions, the student government had the sole responsibility for the recognition of student organizations. Although the most frequent purpose for existing policy was the maintenance of control and orderliness of procedures, many institutions expressed a concern for the educational value of the exercise of both freedom and responsibility by student organizations. In most institutions policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated and were most frequently established by a committee of students, faculty, and administrators. Violations of policy, however, were handled by personnel administrators more frequently than by committees. Policy violations seemed to be very little problem. When they occurred the usual consequences entailed some type of sanction or denial of the privileges accorded to recognized organizations.

Women's Hours—All but two institutions that have women students on campus had formulated a policy with regard to women's hours. This reflects the degree of attention given to this tradition-bound issue. The specific hours imposed varied greatly and seemed dependent on such conditions as whether the institution was located in an urban or rural setting. The largest number of institutions had developed specific hours for all women on some graduated basis (i. e., class, age, and academic standing) and as many as 14 percent of the respondents stated that some women students had no hours. The primary reason for women's hours seemed to revolve around a concern for the security of campus buildings and women students. A number of institutions also used women's hours as a means of ordering student and staff hours. The respondents stated some dissatisfaction with their policy, more interest in liberalization than was noted in most other policy matters, and a concern for simplification. Several called for a rethinking of the entire policy by a student-faculty-administrative committee.

Controversial Speakers—Three fourths of the institutions had a policy requiring the approval or clearance of campus speakers. In most cases, however, the policies were not intended to restrict speakers from appearing on the basis of their controversiality of the content of their topics, but rather to insure that invitations came from bona fide student groups or individuals within the institution and that orderly procedures were maintained. In addition to procedural reasons, freedom of expression and the value of exposing students to a variety of viewpoints formed the purposes for the policies at the majority of the institutions. Generally, policies were formulated by administrative officials or committees and were formally adopted and systematically communicated to the campus community. Similarly, violations of policy were most frequently handled administratively. The typical type of action taken was a reprimand or limitation of privileges.

Student Demonstrations—A sizable number of institutions (40 percent) did not have policies on this type of activity. Nearly all of the institutions with policies permitted demonstrations under certain conditions and controls. Nearly 50 percent allowed demonstrations without advance registration. A standard condition was that the activity should not interfere with the orderly conduct of institutional functions. Over one half of the respondents indicated that their policy was formally adopted and systematically com-

municated. Decision-making bodies below the trustees level and above the student level, in the highest percentage of cases, formulated the policy. The policies were designed to permit freedom of expression and to maintain objectives and the educational process. Violations were most frequently handled by the personnel dean and his staff, and faculty and student conduct committees played an important role. The most common pattern was not to have set penalties for violations and to use penalties of less than dismissal.

Student Publications—Although over 50 percent of the institutions maintained some type of supervision over student publications by requiring them to be responsible to either an administrative or faculty body, very little control or censorship was exercised. The primary institutional concerns were the prevention of slanderous material and the provision of learning experiences for students through the exercise of freedom and responsibility. There was some student involvement in policy-making in this area although it was predominantly an administrative responsibility. Policy violations seemed to be inconsequential.

Faculty-Student Drinking—Well over half of the institutions did not have a policy regarding this matter. Of the institutions that had established policies, a small number prohibited student-faculty drinking per se. The concern in most cases was that faculty not contribute to student violations of civil law or regulations against on-campus drinking, become involved in conduct exhibiting bad taste, or cause embarrassment to the institution. In those institutions that had policies, the policies were formally adopted and systematically communicated. Policies regarding student-faculty drinking were formulated almost exclusively by administrative officials. Violations of policy were usually handled by the personnel staff, and since the faculty member was the primary object of concern, formal action was rarely taken.

Provision of Contraceptives—Only 40 percent of the institutions had given attention to the development of policies regarding the provision of contraceptives. Ten percent of all respondents indicated that their institution would, in certain circumstances, provide contraceptives, while most of the institutions considered this matter to be a private medical concern. The policies tended to be simply a matter of consistent practice.

Student Records—Sixty percent of the institutions had not found it necessary to establish formal policies pertaining to the use of student records. There was, however, a general concern for maintaining certain safeguards to protect the confidentiality of student information. Policy formulation was handled administratively, and virtually no violations of policy were cited.

Use of Students as Research Subjects—The use of students as research subjects has presented few problems in most institutions; consequently, policy formulation on this matter received little attention. There was a general concern, however, that students not be exploited for research purposes.

Importance of the Issues to the Institutions

The issues that were ranked in the upper one-third in order of importance were excessive use of alcohol, off-campus misconduct, women's hours, student dress and appearance, and financial irresponsibility. Student publications, drugs, and deviant sexual behavior were ranked in the upper one-half. *The issues that were of greatest significance were related, for the most part, to control of student actions.* Issues with low rankings were student demonstrations, controversial speakers, student records, faculty-student drinking, provision of contraceptives and use of students as research subjects. In interpreting the ranking, great significance should not be given to the exact position of an issue, but rather whether or not it falls into the higher or lower ranges of importance.

Comparison Among Institutions With Regard to the Degree of Policy Formulation

It was not possible to accept or reject completely any of the four hypotheses. The results, however, generally indicated that there were no differences among institutions from various regions, and of different types, sizes or percentages of the student bodies living on the campus with regard to drugs, financial irresponsibility, recognition of student organizations, deviant sexual behavior, dress and appearance, student demonstrations, publications and use of student records.

Although the four hypotheses were not accepted or rejected in their entirety, a number of differences among institutions on individual policies were found. Faculty drinking with students was a greater concern among the smaller and church-related institutions. Smaller institutions were also more concerned with off-campus misconduct, whereas the institutions with over 5,000 students gave more attention to the formulation of student demonstration policies.

The regional differences with regard to the degree of policy formulation were most notable. The North Central region tended to express more concern for regulatory matters, whereas the New England states tended to be more liberal. The Western region appeared to be more advanced in the development of policies regarding controversial speakers and the use of contraceptives.

Additional Information

On most issues, nearly all of the respondents held the view that the policies were implemented consistently and that they represented the most desirable approach to the problem they were intended to alleviate. Likewise, essentially all of the respondents felt that the president, academic dean, and chief student personnel officer considered social conduct regulations to be an expression of the particular value system which the institution accepted, as well as a means of achieving order in the academic community. In other words, they took the position that inculcation of behavioral standards is a part of the learning process.

A COMPOSITE VIEW OF THE DATA

As indicated in Table 43, on the items related to sexual behavior a large number of institutions did not have policies. Moreover, with reference to both deviant sexual behavior and premarital pregnancy, relatively small numbers of institutions had policies that were formally adopted.

The fact that deviant sexual behavior, premarital pregnancy, (and also provision of contraceptives,) do not involve large numbers of students and are issues that tend to be treated on a confidential level might provide a basis for understanding why so many institutions had not established policies concerning these matters.

In the other areas of control of student behavior, a relatively high percentage of institutions had policies—policies formally adopted in many cases. An exception is found in the case of drug usage, but this variation might be explained by the relative newness, at least on a large scale, of the drug problem on college campuses.

Is it surprising that such a large number of institutions have policies related to the control of student behavior, and that the policies are frequently formally adopted? Probably not. Dress, financial irresponsibility, off-campus misconduct, recognition of student organizations, women's hours, entertainment in residence hall bedrooms, and excessive use of alcohol are issues that have confronted most institutions for many years. Institutions have found it necessary to enact policies in these areas in order to carry out their educational aims, maintain standards of conduct, create a particular kind of environment or influence student development in a certain direction. In some institutions, the policies have resulted from conflict between the administration and students over the granting of greater student freedom.

Student demonstrations, student publications and drug usage were not covered by policies in a large number of institutions. These are areas of current concern and in the future will probably be of even greater significance. In addition, nearly two-thirds of the institutions surveyed did not have policies on student records, and although this may not be a critical issue at this time, it will most likely increase in importance in the years ahead as greater attention is given to the protection of the individual student's rights. In view of the probable intensification of the controversies surrounding student publications, student demonstrations and drug usage, it would seem highly appropriate for institutions to formulate well thought-out positions before crises are created. The heat of conflict is usually no time to formulate policies.

It would appear that there is a relationship between whether an institution had a policy on a certain issue, on the one hand, and how important the institution viewed that issue, on the other. With the exception of entertainment in residence hall bedrooms and recognition of student organizations, those issues which were ranked in the lower half, in terms of importance, tended to be covered less frequently by institutional policy. The issues that ranked lowest, *viz.*, student records, faculty/student drinking, provision of contraceptives and use of students as research subjects, were the subject of institutional policies in only 40 percent of the institutions. It would appear that in view of the lack of difficulty and conflict in these areas, many institutions do not feel compelled to develop policies.

TABLE 43
Degree of Policy Formulation on the Eighteen Issues

Issue	No Policy	No Policy; Concerned	Tot. Instit. w/o Policies	Tot. Instit. w/Policies	Policy Formally Adopted
<i>Percentage Distribution</i>					
Controversial Speakers	15	10	25	75	70
Demonstrations	25	15	40	60	60
Deviant Sex Behavior	15	25	40	60	26
Dress & Appearance	20	14	34	66	78
Drugs	7	52	59	41	32
Entertainment-Residence Hall Bedrooms	8	5	13	87	81
Excessive Use of Alcohol	4	8	12	88	79
Faculty-Student Drinking	46	14	60	40	42
Financial Irresponsibility	3	14	17	83	49
Off-Campus Misconduct	21	14	18	82	70
Premarital Pregnancy	21	29	50	50	22
Provision of Contraceptives	47	13	60	40	28
Publications	28	16	44	56	69
Recognition of Student Organizations	5	2	7	93	88
Required On-Campus Living	11	3	14	86	91
Student Records	42	18	60	40	45
Use of Students as Research Subjects	42	18	60	40	29
Women's Hours	11	2	13	87	96

On most of the issues, the content and purposes of the policies were related to the maintenance of control, order, standards and institutional image. The educational development of students received little direct attention in the establishment of policy and as bases for policy. The issues seemed to be viewed more in terms of institutional welfare rather than student welfare. In part, this might be explained by the fact that most of the policies are directed toward control of particular behavioral problems. In spite of this, it would seem that many more institutions might have presented educational rationales for their policies.

It is true that with reference to financial irresponsibility, required on-campus living and student demonstrations, much greater concern was shown for the educational development of students and their exercise of freedom. Moreover, most of the institutions providing information on the purpose of policies related to student records and the use of students as research subjects indicated that the policies were intended to protect students.

On most issues, the personnel dean or his staff played a prominent role in the processing of violations (Table 48). In a few instances, campus conduct committees were more actively involved than the dean and his staff. This is true particularly where excessive use of alcohol, student publications and women's hours were concerned. On the whole, however, the dean of students' office was mentioned most frequently as the agency responsible for processing violations—which is consistent with the traditional role of the personnel staff in control and discipline.

Generally, when violations of the policies occurred, the penalties imposed were less severe than suspension. This was particularly true for policies related to excessive use of alcohol, dress and appearance, women's hours, publications, controversial speakers, required on-campus living and recognition of student organizations. Violations of policies on deviant sexual behavior, entertainment of the opposite sex in residence hall bedrooms and drugs resulted in suspension in 31 percent or more of the institutions. The greater use of suspension with reference to these issues is probably a reflection of the more serious light in which they are viewed by both the academic community and society at large. Premarital pregnancy resulted in withdrawal in nearly two-thirds of the schools, but the separations occurred for both medical and disciplinary reasons.

Infractions of the policies related to freedom or expression most often resulted in penalties less than suspension. There was, however, some indication that suspension was a possible action in some institutions when the policy on demonstrations was violated, although the highest percentage of institutions took action on the merits of each case.

On the issues of deviant sexual behavior, student records, drugs, premarital pregnancy and provision of contraceptives, the dean or his staff played an important role in policy formulation. Moreover, the administration was the predominating policy-making agency on most issues. Exceptions to this pattern were noted with reference to dress and appearance, women's hours and recognition of student organizations. On these issues, a student faculty committee or student government also played an important role; but student government acting independently was never a major agency in policy development. On some issues, students had an opportunity to influence decision making, but this was through representatives on a student/faculty/administrative body. So, not only did the

dean and his staff play a strong role in policy development, but the administration generally—without direct student/faculty involvement—had primary responsibility for establishing policies on the 18 issues studied.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

One of the stated aims at the outset of this investigation was to identify areas for more intensive research. A number of research ideas have been generated by the study.

The questionnaire used was completed, for the most part, by the chief student personnel administrator at each institution or by one of his staff members. In view of the fact that policy formulation regarding a given issue should take into account campus community concerns, it would appear to be particularly important to ask the president, other administrators, faculty members, the student personnel staff and students to complete a shorter form of the questionnaire. Particular attention might be given to the degree of similarity or difference among these members of the community in their perceptions of the nature and implementation of the policies, the purposes behind the policies and the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction they elicit. Such an investigation could be an invaluable means of identifying areas of internal conflict or policy items which need further attention.

Another useful analysis might be made among institutions of various sizes, types and locations. A forced-choice instrument might enable one to investigate not only the degree of policy formulation, but also differences in policy content, rationale and implementation.

Moreover, an investigation of the process of policy development is most timely. To more carefully analyze the process of policy formulation within given institutions might provide them with the stimulus necessary to effect broader, community-based policy. Further, it would seem appropriate to give greater attention to how institutions process violations of policies in view of present concern for the maintenance of acceptable standards of procedural due process in conduct cases.

Although there was rather general support for existing policies, there were a few notable exceptions. In those instances where a number of institutions were dissatisfied with their present policies, further investigation might bring to light better approaches to the problems.

The research suggested that institutions might well study the effects of policies on the learning process, student morale, mental health and attitudes. Do particular policies tend to support, or impede, development of an environment conducive to learning and personal well-being?

It also would seem desirable to investigate in greater depth the role of the dean of students in policy development and implementation and the perceptions that result from this role. Does his role tend to conflict or be consistent with generally accepted tenets of student personnel work? Does it contribute to or detract from the process of education?

Finally, to replicate the present investigation within five years using revised and improved instruments would provide an interesting and possibly useful impression of the degree of change being wrought in controversial areas by forces now affecting student life in American higher education.

Concluding Remarks

A notable characteristic of higher education is the conflict that exists between elements of the academic community, as well as between the institution itself and society at large. The strife is both growth-producing and, at times, growth-inhibiting. If channeled properly and directed to constructive ends, it can create a more viable and productive educational enterprise. If it is permitted, however, to limit progress and to interfere with the process of learning, then it can become unwholesome and ruinous.

A certain amount of incompatibility of positions is inevitable because of the many different viewpoints, power structures and value systems that are represented by those who support and participate directly in higher education. The challenge is to use the divergence of interests to produce growth and vitality, rather than retardation and destruction. To achieve this end, we must understand the basis of conflict, how unnecessary strife might be reduced and how divergent viewpoints might be reconciled to produce a better institution.

One of the basic causes of discord is that the ever-changing quality of the values and standards of our society makes for less clarity of direction in dealing with campus problems and itself creates student pressures for policy modification—often when the institution would rather not alter its position. This has been true in such areas as women's hours, visitation in residence hall bedrooms, freedom of artistic and literary expression and use of alcoholic beverages.

Another source of conflict has centered around the student's relationship to the academic community, as prescribed by the college or university. Traditionally, the institution has determined the academic and social standards that the student must observe, the learning experiences and services that will be available to him and the procedures and sanctions to be used to insure that he performs at an acceptable level. When admitted, the student has been expected to observe the prescriptions of the institution.

But today's students have not only been critical of the lack of opportunity to participate in the development of academic and social expectations; they have been critical of the whole idea of control and limit-setting. They have felt that restrictions should be at a minimum and that they, the students, should be able to learn and experiment in an environment in which maximum freedom, creativity, innovation and independence is not only tolerated, but encouraged. True, institutions have allowed substantial freedom in recent years where curricular matters are concerned, always within the context of what they feel are reasonable standards and limitations, to the end that their educational objectives remain achievable and their academic communities remain intact. But some very fundamental questions are generated in this controversy. What should be the provisions for freedom of expression on the college campus? Should an institution attempt to restrict expression in any way? If so, under what circumstances? Under what conditions is learning most effectively pursued and how might an institution best create these conditions? To what extent should the student be free to pursue knowledge independently of faculty direction and the discipline of the classroom setting?

Many students and faculty have stated that in traditional learning environments students really cannot learn. In these environments, they say, students are treated impersonally in mass educational situations and are merely expected to regurgitate facts in order to pass an examination—facts that might have no relevance for the real issues they will face in society.

In the face of rapid growth, institutions have found it difficult to break away from tried educational patterns, and their failure to make marked and dramatic changes to achieve greater freedom and personalization makes it appear to students that "the administration" really does not care about improving the quality of education.

In the United States, we are committed to mass education, and institutions are expected to accommodate increasing numbers of students. In view of these circumstances, we must provide personalized and relevant educational experiences. It would seem that the best approach is not to replace the traditional learning environments with "free universities," but rather to make the necessary adjustments within the existing academic communities, where the foundations of good education are manifestly present. "Free universities" would not bring the quality of education for which some students—and others—are striving.

The ability of institutions to improve the quality of education is oftentimes impaired by the demands of elements within society at large, and this is difficult for students to understand. They argue that the institution should be able to chart its own course, free of external interference. In their opinion political and financial considerations, institutional "imagery" and community support—or lack of it—should not be permitted to alter educational programs or policies. The reality of the situation, however, is that the institution cannot function in isolation of the community, nor can it lightly disregard the good will of the legislature and general population, both of whom have a stake in what happens in higher education. And so, at times, the institution may be forced to adjust its position in view of external pressures. The administration, in turn, is charged with "selling out" the cause of education. But the institution cannot always make accommodations if it is to maintain its integrity, vitality and morale. The key question then becomes: When should external demands be rejected—or, put another way—what cost should the institution be willing to pay for its independence?

Rapid and marked change in our society will make it even more difficult for the academic community to maintain its integrity and essential purposes in the face of societal pressure for expansion and adjustment in higher education. Controversy over what constitutes good education, and who should decide this question, will increase as colleges and universities are forced to find new methods of learning to accommodate substantial growth in student population and as students demand more freedom both in the classroom and in extracurricular life. Somehow, institutions must recognize the legitimate concerns of society while retaining the essential elements of academic quality.

To cope with the problems presented above, mechanisms for reaching necessary agreement and understanding must be created. Through this process, institutional equilibrium can be attained. Probably the most important consideration in achieving and maintaining this balance is provision for the active participation of members of the academic com-

munity in the decision-making process. The data generated by this study indicate that decisions in the area of student affairs are made largely by the administration, without strong community participation. Can a viable community of learning be established if the administration is the primary policy-making agency, and can necessary understanding and agreement be reached without active community participation in campus decisions?

The fundamental ingredient in this process is acceptance of the view that all elements in the academic community can, in varying degree, make beneficial contributions in policy development. Evolution of effective community action is not an easy thing to bring about, because an institution of higher education is in reality an oligarchy. Power is vested in a board and a president, rather than in the community, and any role that students and faculty play in decision making is advisory. This is true even in areas where considerable freedom of action has been granted to faculty and students, because higher authority always has the power of veto.

In spite of this limitation, the advisory function of members of the community can be made a significant factor in the administration of the institution. Time must be taken to develop the means of involving elements of the community in policy development, and their participation must make a difference in the type of policies that are established. Over time, the administration must demonstrate its willingness to cooperate with community government and abide by its actions, except in those few cases where decisions might endanger the life or primary mission of the institution.

Another important factor in obtaining institutional equilibrium in the face of competing values and needs is the development of well thought-out policies consistent with community-established positions on academic freedom and learning. In particular, more attention must be given to policy development in critical and controversial areas. Positions that have been carefully formulated will not be free of weaknesses; but if the development has involved considerable community participation, the complaints can be processed with minimum conflict. In the absence of policies, administrators may be uncertain at times as to what is best for the institution and students, and they may act unwisely. In the heat of battle, concern for saving face, sheer expediency or a hazy notion of what "the public expects" can become the real directing force—in place of action which, in the long run, might make for a better community of learning. In such an embattled situation, it is not difficult for an administration to engender ill feeling among students and faculty alike.

Thus, institutions must not wait until strife exists to give thought to policy formulation in crucial areas. In the present study, it was found that on particular issues many institutions had not established policies. Does this finding suggest that the issues had not been of significant-enough concern to warrant establishment of a policy—or have institutions been negligent in failing to formulate institutional guidelines? Do institutions tend to establish policies as a result of confrontation and crisis, rather than careful deliberation?

Existing policies must also be carefully and thoughtfully evaluated. Are they desirable and effective? Are they consistent with the stated objectives of the institution and do they tend to facilitate or hinder the learning process? Are they a source of tension and anxiety because they reflect a lack of respect for personal dignity, the welfare of students and accepted concepts of freedom and learning?

The study also indicated that there was considerable emphasis, in both the policy statements themselves and the purposes that underlie them, on control of student behavior and maintenance of standards of conduct. It would seem that there was a tendency to establish policy from the vantage point of institutional welfare, rather than student welfare. The needs of the institution must be reflected in decisions; but this should not be done at the expense of the student's development. Ideally, it would seem that when policies are developed, the guiding criterion should be to create a viable community of learning which respects the worth, dignity and individuality of community members. If this guidepost were kept clearly in sight, the well-being of all concerned would be better served.

In addition, the type of relationship that the institution has with the student is important in determining how controversial issues are dealt with and what policies are finally established. It is clear that the student is in a learning role and that he is not equal to the faculty in terms of knowledge and scholarly attainment. This does not mean, however, that he should be expected to function in a narrow, restricted environment without freedom to explore and to test ideas. He should be granted some measure of freedom and independence to pursue knowledge, and he should be allowed to participate in decision making, consistent with his abilities and maturity. He should not be treated as an object, to be molded without concern for human sensitivities and his own worth. He should be seen as a learning organism, who functions most effectively when nurtured through a variety of personalized and related educational experiences which foster innovation and creative behavior.

Another important factor in institutional balance is the role played by the dean of students. This individual will find himself increasingly at the center of controversy in the years ahead, and if his role is not more carefully defined, he will find it more and more difficult to be effective. He will experience pressure from his president and from his students and parents, and often these pressures will be competing and conflicting. He will be forced to decide to whom he owes his primary loyalty and toward what concepts and values he will find direction. How the dean responds to such pressures will determine, to an important degree, how critical problems are resolved and, of course, how effective he is in contributing to student development.

In particular, the role of the dean of students in community decision-making needs clarification. Traditionally, the dean has been expected to serve as a buffer for the president and, at least in some schools, to maintain the *status quo* with a minimum of student unrest. In this role, he has been the key administrative official, next to the president, in controlling policy development or change, and in implementing whatever policy is instituted. He might have a student government, a student/faculty committee or a faculty senate committee to consult with—but he can control to some significant degree the final content of policy.

Can the dean, in this dual role of policy developer and implementer, be effective as a counselor, consultant and stimulator of learning? If he is the key authority figure in the development of policy, or in the resolution of conflict with students, can he be successful in bringing about real understanding of the issues? Will students seek him out for advice

and information? Or will they view him as that person in power whom they must fight in order to attain their goals?

The dean's role in administration of discipline must also be evaluated. The present inquiry revealed that the dean and his staff were heavily involved in processing violations of institutional policy. Is it reasonable to expect that the dean of students will be viewed by students as a source of help when he is responsible for taking action against students in conduct cases? Can he effectively function as both a disciplinarian and counselor? Should the dean or his staff be responsible for both preparation and final disposition of a case? Should the involvement of the student personnel office be limited to preparation and presentation of cases, with the responsibility for determining disciplinary action vested in a conduct committee?

The effectiveness of the dean of students has often been limited because he has been expected to perform conflicting and unnecessary roles. The dean of students, in concert with representatives of the academic community, must carefully define his job and determine whether the demands placed on him make it difficult or impossible to perform his primary mission, that of contributing to student development. Are certain functions essentially incompatible? If so, can they be modified to make them compatible, or should particular functions be assigned to someone else in the institution? If these questions can be resolved, it is possible that more realistic tasks can be assigned to the dean, and that he can be more productive in these assignments.

APPENDIX A

Representative Policy Statements

DEVIAN'T SEXUAL BEHAVIOR

Students guilty of deviant sexual behavior are disciplined. The usual penalty for such misconduct is suspension from the University. Sexual deviation is considered to be anti-social behavior and not consistent with the standards required of students at this institution.

When the deviant behavior involves active solicitation, prostitution, and active homosexuality among students, either on the campus, or in the community, the student would be withdrawn or dismissed from college.

Students who are found to be demonstrating deviant sexual behavior are required to have a period of separation from the University, urged to obtain psychiatric help, and granted readmission only upon presentation of a psychiatric report that they have undergone treatment and are capable of adapting to the University environment.

Such matters are the object of investigation, medical consultation, if deemed necessary, and consideration by the Student Life Committee. The seriousness of the offense and the situation of the offender will determine the course of action.

Those involved in deviation from the standard are expected to avail themselves of counseling, and may also be subject to penalties up to and including suspension for one year.

We tend to regard most occurrences in this area as a counseling matter; however, when this behavior involves and disrupts other students, we might take administrative action.

The action would depend on the circumstances. If it were possible to help the individual without endangering the community, the student would be counseled. If he could not be helped, we would find it necessary to separate him from the institution.

The psychiatrist works with the individual to determine how deep seated the trouble is. Where the psychiatrist feels that treatment will eliminate the difficulty promptly, he receives that treatment in school. In cases of deep seated trouble he may be sent home to the parents for extended treatment.

DRESS AND APPEARANCE

Informal attire, including blue jeans, may be worn at breakfasts, Friday dinner, Saturday lunch and dinner, and Sunday supper. Clothes suitable to the classroom are worn for lunch and dinner. Dress dinners, for which men wear coat and tie and women wear heels and hose, are held on Sundays and special occasions.

Attire must be presentable and neat, especially in the classroom. Suit coat, dress shirt, and tie are required at the evening meal in the University dining hall. (During warm weather, dress shirt and tie.)

The student is to dress in accordance with good taste. The rule enjoins wearing a suit and tie for Sunday Mass, Sunday meals, concerts, and auditorium exercises and wearing a suit and tie, a sports jacket, or a sweater for evening meals. Blue jeans, fatigue clothes, gym clothes, and shirts without collars are only for recreational activities.

Sunday dinner will be considered a dress-up affair for both men and women. Men will wear suits or slacks and sportcoats or dress sweaters with dress shirt and tie or buttoned sport shirt and tie. Women will wear afternoon dresses or suits.

All students should be neatly attired. Men should be neatly shaven and wear suitcoat and tie. Women should observe dress standards in keeping with good taste.

Campus dress is treated primarily as a matter of individual taste and style. Students, however, are encouraged to be neat and clean and to exercise good judgment.

DRUGS

Our statement on the Principles of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures include this statement: "Violation of national, state, or local laws makes a student liable not only to prosecution and punishment by civil courts but also to disciplinary action by the college."

Should we learn of any traffic in drugs, we would immediately notify the proper civil officials.

Any student found using or possessing, without authorized medical supervision, narcotics, barbiturates, amphetamines, or any experimental drug classified as such by the Food & Drug Administration, will be subject to severe disciplinary action.

The university does not condone the possession, use, or distribution of marihuana,

LSD, or other hallucinogens and narcotics by any of its students. Any student known to be possessing, using, or distributing such drugs is subject to disciplinary action.

On-campus violators will be handled as counseling situations as long as possible. Off-campus publicity may limit this. Off-campus violations are civil matters unless they involve organized group life.

Possession of stimulant, depressant, narcotic, or hallucinogenic drugs and other agents having potential for abuse, except on a physician's or dentist's prescription, violates State and Federal laws and is prohibited. The selling, bartering, exchanging, and giving away of such drugs to any person not intended to possess them is also illegal and is prohibited.

Administrative action would be taken in cooperation with law enforcement agencies whenever narcotics or illegal drugs are found to be used by students. Our Health Service would be consulted with regard to stimulants which are not necessarily illegal drugs.

ENTERTAINMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX IN RESIDENCE HALL BEDROOMS

University students not residing with their spouse are prohibited from having members of the opposite sex in their unchaperoned living quarters and will be subject to indefinite suspension from the University if this regulation is violated.

The lobby of each hall is designed for the reception and entertainment of visitors. Members of the opposite sex are not permitted to enter living units and student rooms, and are expected to leave the lobbies at 11:00 p.m. Male students or relatives helping women residents with luggage are not allowed to pass the hall lobby or stairwell entrance.

Students are not permitted in the residence hall bedrooms of students of the opposite sex except during a scheduled open house.

Visiting hours between sexes in residence halls bedrooms are from 2-4 p.m. Sunday afternoons. Guests must register in the lobby, doors must be left open 12 inches, and guests must sign out on departure.

On Friday and Saturday nights, if a student resident has registered with the Dean for informal dating privileges, lady guests may be entertained in rooms approved for this purpose until 12:30 o'clock. At the time of formal parties, this privilege is extended until 2:30 a.m.

Students shall not be permitted to enter the living quarters of another student, except during a scheduled open house. Open houses may be scheduled on Sunday from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. Room doors must be open and students must conduct themselves in a manner acceptable to the University community.

Single-couple dating in dormitory rooms is permitted on Sunday afternoons. Two-couple dating in dormitory rooms is permitted on Saturday nights as part of dormitory section parties.

EXCESSIVE USE OF ALCOHOL

The college believes that it will have the most desirable community if its students do not use alcoholic beverages while in attendance at the college. The college specifically prohibits every student from possessing or using any alcoholic beverage on the campus, in any off-campus student room, or at any meeting, event, or activity of any organized student group.

The possession or consumption by students of alcoholic beverages of any kind or alcoholic content anywhere on the campus or in any University building is prohibited. Alcoholic beverages may not be served or consumed at any dance or other social functions given in the name of the University or sponsored by any student organization or group. Sponsoring student organizations or groups are expected to enforce this regulation, violation of which may be punished by loss of social privileges, probation, suspension, or dismissal from the University.

Possession and/or use of alcoholic beverages on campus is grounds for immediate suspension. Off-campus use of alcohol is also of concern, but no action is taken unless the student seriously endangers himself, the college image, etc.

The college does not approve the use of alcoholic liquors on the part of its students either on or off the campus. Conduct detrimental to either the student or the college following the use of alcoholic liquor shall be considered evidence of intoxication and shall constitute sufficient reason for action which may lead to separation of the student from the college.

The excessive use of alcoholic beverages under any circumstances is not condoned by the University and undesirable conduct resulting therefrom will be subject to disciplinary action.

Immediate and severe disciplinary action will be taken if a student appears on the campus or at college-sponsored functions after having consumed alcoholic beverages or is in a condition that brings discredit to the individual or the college.

Disorder and bad manners arising from the use of liquor are considered serious offenses. Students involved in such offenses render themselves liable to suspension.

Aside from legal restrictions, we have no rules about alcohol as such. Individuals with drinking problems are counseled and referred to the Mental Health unit of the Student Health Service.

FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Unpaid bills with the college bring debarment from classes; in case of unpaid bills in the community, opportunity is given for payment but disciplinary action is taken if obligation is not paid. If bad checks are passed on campus a fine is levied and future checks are not cashed. Bad checks passed off campus might bring disciplinary action.

We will not act as a collection agency for outside groups but we will counsel our students regarding their financial responsibility. In cases of unpaid college bills, we will bar students from taking exams or graduation.

If financial irresponsibility occurs within the college, student records are withheld or registration denied. We do not take action in case of debts incurred by students off campus. We do not act as a collection agent nor do we use the power of the State to collect debts.

If, after repeated warning, bills to the University are not paid, class suspension is imposed pending suitable arrangements. Disciplinary actions are not taken except with organizations in which case social privileges are denied until debts are assumed.

No credits will be released by the Registrar's Office until all accounts are paid. A student is not eligible for re-enrollment or graduation unless all accounts are settled.

A student in debt to the University at the end of any semester will not be eligible to take the semester examinations and will not be permitted to re-register for the following semester; nor will he be entitled to receive a statement or transcript of his credits until indebtedness shall have been settled.

UNACCEPTABLE OFF-CAMPUS BEHAVIOR

A general conduct statement is a part of our regulations. The college reserves the right to review off-campus behavior.

Every student has the responsibility to observe and to help maintain a code of

personal behavior and social relationships which will contribute to his educational experiences and the educational effectiveness of the University. Higher education is a privilege; it is not a right. The conduct of a student at—University is expected to reflect a responsible attitude toward University regulations as well as the laws of the community, the state, and the nation. Situations other than those mentioned separately in this guidebook, which will warrant disciplinary action are those in which a student 1) endangers or seriously threatens the life or physical safety of others or self, 2) leads or participates actively in destructive group action, 3) has serious or repeated minor difficulties with law enforcement authorities, 4) commits sexual immorality, 5) does not respect public and private property, 6) refuses to cooperate with efforts made to help him adjust to University responsibilities and 7) persists in conduct which, though perhaps less serious than violations listed above, eventually would serve to discredit the University and/or its students. These standards apply to all students, both on and off campus, as long as they are enrolled in the University; assumes that the registering of the student implies full acceptance of the standards stated in this book.

Students are expected to manifest both within and outside the precincts of the University the respect for order, morality, personal honor and the rights of others which is required for Christian gentlemen and good citizens.

A student is expected to conduct himself, both within and outside of the University, in a way that will reflect favorably on himself and on the University. The University reserves the right to deny admission to any applicant, to discontinue the registration of any student, or to withhold the degree of any student if, in the opinion of the University authorities, his further association is not conducive to the best interests of the student or of the University.

If the courts convict a student of a felony, we usually dismiss this student.

After conviction in any civil court, the student is again tried by our Student-Faculty Discipline Committee on the premise that his actions reflect negatively on the college.

The University expects its students to be ladies and gentlemen in conducting their affairs on and off the campus and further expects that they will conduct their affairs in accordance with State and local laws. While enforcement of local and State laws is the responsibility of others, the University is concerned when violations are brought to its attention and reserves the right to take such action as is necessary to protect the University community; e. g., a student charged with burglary would be given a leave of absence until the matter was settled before the courts. In most

cases, the University takes no action in the matter until it is settled by other authorities. If the misbehavior comes to the attention of the University, but not the local police or other authority, the University most often would take disciplinary action without referral to other authority.

Any student who conducts himself in such a way as to bring severe public or private criticism upon the University may take it for granted that school authorities will take up the case with a view to disciplinary action.

PREMARITAL PREGNANCY

In the early stages of pregnancy, the girl would finish the term. This is possible especially if the pregnancy is still unknown to the other students. When the pregnancy becomes evident, the student is requested to leave for medical reasons.

An administrative withdrawal would occur in cases of premarital pregnancy. The actual time of withdrawal could depend upon the time element of her condition and semester. Until the baby is born, the student would not be allowed to re-enroll.

- a. Referral to the medical office for diagnosis and counseling.
- b. Assist student to inform parents (if under 21).
- c. Arrange for medical leave of absence.

Premarital sexual relations are against the divine natural law. For this reason the unmarried pregnant woman would not be permitted to continue school—not as punishment for violation of the law but because her continued enrollment would cause increasing comment and criticism of her and of the institution.

We take no action concerning a pregnancy except to provide help to the girl. No punishment is warranted.

Counseling with the persons involved would be the appropriate action here. A man would be made aware of his responsibilities and the woman would be counseled with regard to health matters and the problems faced in school; parents would be notified and consulted.

We have not considered pregnant girls for disciplinary action, but have handled each case according to what seems best for the students involved. It is, of course, usually advisable for the girl to withdraw as soon as possible, unless a marriage results. We believe that our major responsibility is to help students if they find themselves in this position and, of course, to use our influence in every possible way to discourage the kind of behavior which results in this type of problem.

REQUIRED ON-CAMPUS LIVING

All students, with the exception of married students, who do not live at home with parents or close relatives are required to live in a college residence hall.

As long as rooms are available all single undergraduate students not residing with their parents or guardians are required to live in University residence halls. In the event that all residence halls are filled, upper class students may obtain permission for off-campus housing. Priority for such permission will be in the following order: those who are over 21, seniors, juniors, and sophomores.

All full-time undergraduate students not living in their own homes or with relatives are required to live in University-approved housing. Undergraduate students aged 21 or over are exempt when their housing arrangements are approved in advance of occupancy by the office or the Director of Housing.

All single freshmen, sophomores, and juniors who do not live in the city or do not commute daily to the city are required to live on campus. Seniors may be required to live on campus if there is room for them in the residence halls.

Freshmen and sophomore men are required to live in University residence halls; all women are required to live in University residence halls or sorority houses.

The University requires that an undergraduate woman under 23 years of age, who is not living with her parents or her husband, live in a University residence. All freshman men are required to live in University residence halls. Sophomores, juniors, and seniors may choose to live in one of three types of University housing or in off-campus accommodations.

Undergraduate women under 20 years of age or with less than junior status are required to live in residence halls or college inspected off-campus housing. Junior and senior women and women 20 years or older may take independent housing; written parental permission is required for those under 21 years of age.

All preliminary and first-year students who are not living at home or with relatives are expected to live in a residence provided by the University, so far as facilities permit. Men and women desiring to live off-campus must obtain permission from either the Dean of Men or the Dean of Women. Women students under 21 years of age must produce written parental permission in order to live off-campus.

RECOGNITION OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Student organizations must submit a list of members, a list of officers, name of faculty adviser, and constitution to student government. If student government approves, it is forwarded to student welfare committee (faculty, students, staff) for final approval.

Student groups may be formed on the campus to carry out activities related to the academic and social program of the University. No student groups may be officially formed or continue to operate within the University without the approval of the Council of Deans. A petition indicating approval of the organization by the Student Executive Committee, setting forth the objectives of the organization, membership requirement, proposed constitution or by-laws, names of all charter members, and the faculty adviser or advisers. The Student Affairs Executive Committee shall forward its recommendation to the Council of Deans which will then take final action.

Each new student organization hereafter proposed must apply for recognition at the Office of Student Affairs. It is advisable to discuss preliminary plans with the student organization advisers in that office in advance and to produce the necessary application form. When submitting its application for recognition the proposed group must file: a copy of its constitution and by-laws, a list of its officers and faculty advisers, and a statement of its membership policy which must show, to the satisfaction of the Committee on Student Life, that it can, without question, exercise the right of freely selecting its members, using as criteria the merits of the individual person irrespective of race, color, or national origin.

Any honorary, social organization, club, living group, political party or association must comply with the following stipulations and come (if requested) before the Organizations Review Subcommittee of the Student Life Committee for recognition:

- a. Submit to the Activity Center three copies of an acceptable constitution and/or bylaws conforming to the standards set by *Roberts Rules of Order Revised*.
- b. Have a faculty adviser. A list of advisers is available in the Activity Center. Living organizations must have faculty and/or alumni advisers who are approved by the Dean of Men or Dean of Women.
- c. Members must meet the minimum GPA requirement for holding office.
- d. Submit a petition containing the signatures of students interested in founding the organization to show that there is interest in the organization.
- e. Be able to show evidence of financial stability.
- f. Be able to show it does not duplicate existing organizations or does not conflict with local, state, or federal statutes.

- g. Not deny consideration in membership to any student because of his race, religion, or his ethnic origin.
- h. Must submit an annual report due at the Activity Center each spring after election of new officers (May).

Any organization not complying with the procedures for obtaining recognition will be assumed to be defunct, and recognition by the university will be withdrawn.

Student government constitution requires that all student organizations in order to have official recognition must be approved by the Student Senate, faculty advisers are not required.

Student organizations must be approved and recognized by the student government. They are allowed three organizational meetings after which they present a constitution and statement of purpose. If approved they then elect officers and faculty adviser. They may apply for funds after they have been recognized for one semester.

WOMEN'S HOURS

Freshmen have weekday hours of 9:00 p.m.; upperclass students have 10:30 p.m. weekday hours and all undergraduate women have 12:30 a.m. weekend curfew.

The closing hour for women's dormitories, Monday through Thursday, is 10:00 p.m. On Friday and Saturday, the closing hour for freshmen is 11:00 p.m.; for upperclass women, 12:00 midnight. Dormitories close for both freshman and upperclass men on Sunday at 11:00 p.m.

Freshman and sophomore women must be in their living unit by 10:00 p.m. on Sunday through Thursday; juniors and seniors, by 10:30 p.m. On Friday and Saturday evenings, freshmen, sophomores, and juniors must be in by 12:00 midnight; seniors may remain out until 1:00 a.m.

As of Fall, 1966, freshmen have 10:30 p.m. closing hours while the remaining undergraduate women have midnight hours from Sunday through Thursday. On weekends, freshmen through juniors have 1:30 a.m. closing hours while seniors have 2:00 a.m. on Friday and 3:00 a.m. on Saturday.

On Sunday through Thursday evenings, first semester freshmen and students on academic probation have 11:00 p.m. hours; all other students must be in residence by midnight. On Friday and Saturday evenings all women must be in by 2:00 a.m.

Our policy is based on the belief that responsible self-government is a growing,

learning process. The hours for each class are, therefore, extended each year until finally, in a girl's senior year, she has the privilege of signing out a key and setting her own curfew.

Senior and junior women and those over 21 years of age have no hours. Sophomores have 1:00 a.m. hours the first semester, 2:00 a.m. during the second semester. Freshmen have 10:30 p.m. hours Sunday through Thursday and 12:00 midnight on Friday and Saturday during their first semester; Sunday through Thursday, 11:30 p.m. and Friday and Saturday 12:30 a.m. during their second semester.

We provide an orderly progression in responsibility for the student by allowing senior women and women over 21 years of age to come and go freely without hour restrictions. Sophomore and junior women with parental permission also have no hours, otherwise, 11:00 p.m. weekday and 1:00 a.m. weekend restrictions. All freshman women have 11:00 p.m. weekday and 1:00 a.m. weekend hours.

INVITATION OF CONTROVERSIAL SPEAKERS TO CAMPUS

Restrictions upon selection of such speakers are as minimal as the goals of a Catholic institution of higher learning will permit. They can probably be reduced to two: speakers must not engage in speech of an inflammatory nature, nor encourage a kind of action which is forbidden by the rules of the University or prohibited by federal, state, or local laws, and, no speaker may advocate opposition to principles of faith and morals of the Catholic Church. Discussion of viewpoints differing from the Catholic Church is permitted.

It is University policy to permit recognized student organizations to present diverse points of view from speakers and programs to inform themselves on issues of contemporary concern, including politics, religion, ethics, and morals. In presenting controversial issues, the organization will be expected to subject the speaker to questions and to have the meeting chaired by the group's faculty adviser or other faculty member. The University will make its facilities available to candidates for statewide or national public office from each political party recognized as such under the laws of the State.

Invitations should come in every instance from a recognized group on campus, a member of the faculty, or a member of the administration. Student organizations must exercise care and prudence in their choice of speakers, remembering that an institution cannot be wholly disassociated in the public mind from views expressed on its campus. An invitation in no way implies approval by the college of what will be said or done by the speaker. Proposed invitations must be registered in the President's Office prior to issuance. While most speakers could be justified as "educational", efforts should be made that single speakers are not solely used for "shock"

or "spectacle" purposes. Rather they should tend to fit into a broader program of the organization of the college. The invitation to outside speakers must always represent the desire of a recognized student group and not the will of an external organization.

Recognized student organizations may invite any speaker to the campus subject to the provision that the speaker not advocate the overthrow of the government by force. Organization must, of course, follow established registration procedures.

STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS

The administration of the college, recognizing the necessity of complete observance of all state statutes by the students and the staff of the college, and desiring to reaffirm that necessity, resolves that if any group of students gathers in such manner as to disturb the public peace, excite public alarm, or do violence to any person or property, or gathers in any manner so as to bring disgrace or disrepute to the college, or if any group of students refuses to disperse or to assist in dispersing such a gathering upon request from duly elected or appointed officials of the state, county, or town upon request from the College Administration, such students shall be subject to disciplinary action including suspension or dismissal from the college.

We maintain that students should be able to act as individual citizens in exercising their right to protest. We try to help them understand the line between legal and illegal forms of protest, and if the actions of some students violate the rights of others or disrupt the normal processes of the institution, disciplinary action, including expulsion, could result.

No class or group of students may engage in any public effort as a body representing the University or any organization in the University without the permission of the Dean of Students. Student organizations which deem it necessary to hold meetings off-campus must obtain written approval from the president of the undergraduate students federation well in advance of the meeting. Such groups may be held responsible for their collective and individual behavior off campus.

Under the guarantees established by the first amendment of the U. S. Constitution, the University recognizes the right of students to freedom of expression within constitutional and statutory limitations and regulatory measures of the University. There must be no interference with the normal functions of the University and especially with classroom instruction, office and student privacy, study conditions, and free movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. When a rally or other such gathering is planned or public address is to be used, clearance must be obtained from the Office of the Dean of Students.

Because the rights of free speech and peaceable assembly are fundamental to the democratic process, the University supports rights of students and other members of the University community to express their views or to protest against actions and opinions with which they disagree.

The University also recognizes a concurrent obligation to maintain on the campus an atmosphere conducive to academic work, to preserve the dignity and seriousness of University ceremonies and public exercises, and to respect the private rights of all individuals.

Campus demonstrations may be conducted in areas which are generally available to the public, provided such demonstrations are conducted in an orderly manner, do not interfere with vehicular or pedestrian traffic, do not interfere with classes, scheduled meetings, and ceremonies, or with other educational processes of the University, and are not held within University buildings, stadia, amphitheaters, or fields while University functions are in progress therein, or in the private residential areas of the campus.

As a part of our democratic tradition, students are encouraged as responsible citizens to study social issues and to express their convictions within the context of acceptable modes of expression: public discussion, debate, petition, public rallies, picketing, and demonstrations. In doing so, students must accept the responsibility for learning the art of reasoned dissent and thoughtful examination of controversial issues. Whether expressing themselves as individuals or as organized groups, they are expected to conduct themselves responsibly, and to respect the basic educational goals of the University.

Picketing, sit-ins, etc. would be allowed either on or off the campus, so long as the business of the college was not interrupted and so long as the participants were willing to accept responsibility (personal) for violations of law.

We recognize the rights of students to demonstrate in any manner that does not disrupt the business of the University or interfere with the rights of other students. We take no notice of off-campus demonstrations that do not involve the name of the University.

RESPONSIBILITY OF STUDENT PUBLICATIONS TO THE COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION OR FACULTY

Student publications are considered a part of total educational experience. The University expects student publications to exemplify good journalism—responsible journalism. The collegiate press is a learning experience. Faculty teachers and advisers provide the professional know-how and active guidance for publications. The University student publication policy respects the freedom of student editors to

determine content. Materials selected shall measure up to the highest standards of responsible writing and good taste. The editorial policy shall support the aims and objectives of the University.

It is not the policy of the Dean of Students Office or the Student Welfare Committee to censor publications or news media. It is the policy to hear and judge matters of libel, slander, detraction, and calumny which appear in student publications or news media and which are referred to them. They are interested in both the legal and moral aspects of any such referral. These matters will be considered disciplinary matters and sanctioned as such.

University students are mature enough to have opinions about things that concern them. It is recognized that editors of student publications will continue to be elected by their respective editorial boards. The feeling is that editors shall have sufficient experience and judgment to express their opinion editorially. So long as such opinions are supported by the facts, represent considered judgment, and are reasonable in tone, they deserve a hearing. This applies, of course, to the "letters to the editor" column as well as to the editorial column as such. Where opinions are of interest and importance to the campus at large, the editorial and "letters to the editor" columns are a proper place for their expression. In representing and interpreting the student point of view, the University publications must be fair and reasonable, decent in their presentation of news and opinion, sensitive to their obligations as responsible publications, unyielding to outside pressure, tolerant of opinions which differ from their own, impartial in the presentation of news and opinions as between student political groups, and above all, committed to the best interest of the University at large to which they owe their first and greatest responsibility.

All student publications—college newspapers, literary and humor magazines, academic periodicals and yearbooks—should enjoy full freedom of the press. Except for the relatively few university dailies which are independent financially, college publications in general are dependent on the administration's favor in that they use campus facilities and are subsidized either directly by the college or indirectly by a tax on student funds. This dependence should not be used as a means of limiting freedom of expression within the bounds of law and decency.

Each publication must have a faculty adviser who is *not* empowered to exercise censorship. The advisers and other members of the faculty and administration attempt to educate students on the responsibilities of a free press, but not through formalized institutional policy or any kind of pre- or post-censorship.

FACULTY DRINKING WITH STUDENTS

This is not to be done under any circumstances since drinking by students is prohibited regardless of the setting.

Action would be taken if faculty-student drinking negatively affected either student or faculty performance or if the incidents reflected negatively upon the institution.

There is nothing to prevent a faculty member from drinking with students so long as it is not directly associated with a University activity.

This is a typical matter of a "gentlemen's agreement", and unless a situation developed or a complaint of some kind was registered, the University would not take action. Crucial matter here, of course, is the age of the students and whether they are legally able to obtain and consume alcohol.

USE OF STUDENT RECORDS

Student records will be available to authorized college persons only.

Student records are not made available to outsiders without permission from the student.

Student records are considered confidential information. They are released only to individual students themselves, members of the official University family (faculty and administration), Federal and State investigators, and admission officers of other institutions. The student is permitted to see his permanent record card under glass; records are interpreted to Federal and State investigators; members of the official University family have direct access to records. Information is provided to other academic institutions upon request. Private concerns gain information about a student only if he gives clearance. Medical information is not released to anyone without the clearance of the person involved, or upon order of the State or Federal Courts.

Transcripts are sent out only at the request of the individual student. Student files are not available to inquirers outside the College and comments on a student's religious, social, or political activities are limited according to the student's own wish to have this information released.

Employers, other colleges, and investigating agencies can obtain the academic transcript by request. Disciplinary records which are adverse are conveyed only when not jeopardizing the welfare and safety of others.

USE OF STUDENTS AS RESEARCH SUBJECTS

Parental permission and a complete understanding of the nature of the project (under 21 years of age). Student permission and a complete understanding of the nature of the project and a signed statement.

Student must give his permission. Researcher must have written statement concerning use of students and their records. Release of information about students must eliminate name and any identifying data.

When requests for such research projects arrive, deans and other officers of the college consult to see whether the college should cooperate, whether doing so would be an invasion of too much of the student's time or his personal feelings. Ordinarily when the college does agree to cooperate, we insist upon seeing all the letters and forms that may be used, and insist that ordinarily, if at all reasonable, the matter be described as purely voluntary by the student. We also ask staff specialists to study the project and to advise us.

Students engaging in such projects must be willing subjects; they must be aware that they are being used; the project itself must be legal.

The University adheres to United States Public Health Service policy of February 8, 1966, governing the participation of human beings as subjects in research. The Dean of the Graduate Division has appointed an Advisory Committee on Safeguards in Research on Human Subjects to implement the rules and policies of the Public Health Service. Administrative action in this area would relate to use of Public Health Service funds only.

Only when the institution serves to gain from the research project, the students do not lose much time, and the students approve of the request (without pressure).

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Excerpts

NASPA DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

"An Investigation of Institutional Policy
on Controversial Topics"

The purpose of this survey is to collect "baseline" information about a) the extent to which colleges and universities have formulated institutional policies on eighteen selected topics, b) the purposes and rationale for these policies, c) the methods by which these policies were formulated, and d) the nature of their implementation. This study should not be viewed as pressure in the direction of uniform policies and procedures for higher education at the expense of pluralism and diversity among American colleges and universities; it is instead an attempt to obtain certain information which will be of value to NASPA members in their own institutional setting.

For a variety of excellent reasons, many colleges and universities do not have enacted policies even in areas which are of obvious concern to them. Therefore, on many, if not most, of the topics in this survey we expect that only a small proportion of the institutions in our sample will have formally enacted policies. At the same time, the term "institutional policy" is *not* here restricted to matters on which there is a formally enacted, written policy. We are interested, as well, in those policies and procedures which, while not formally enacted, are clearly agreed upon and understood—at least in the dean's office.

Please supply the requested information on each of the following pages. If additional space is needed for any of your responses, please continue on the reverse side of *the same sheet* of paper as you began your statement. Please note that you are asked to provide detailed information on only *nine* policy areas even though item ten asks you to rank order all eighteen topics to be included in the *final report* of this project which *will be sent to you* upon its completion. The other nine items are included in the alternate form of this questionnaire which is being sent to half of your NASPA Colleagues.

1. Title of person filling out questionnaire: _____
2. Type of institution:
 - _____ Public Liberal Arts College
 - _____ Public University
 - _____ Independent Liberal Arts College
 - _____ Independent University
 - _____ Church-related College or University (Catholic)
 - _____ Church-related College or University (Protestant)
 - _____ Teachers College
 - _____ Technical Institution

3. Total Enrollment:
 - ☐ Less than 1500 ☐ 1500 to 5000 ☐ More than 5000
4. Approximate per cent of student body living on-campus:
 - ☐ Less than 33% ☐ More than 66% but not all
 - ☐ 33% to 66% ☐ All live on campus
5. Regional accrediting association:
 - ☐ New England or Middle States
 - ☐ Southern
 - ☐ North Central
 - ☐ Western or Northwest
6. In general, would the President, Academic Dean and Student Personnel Officers at your institution view social conduct regulations as
 - ☐ simply devices for maintaining order within the college community.
 - ☐ essential expressions of a value system which the institution wishes students to accept as well as a means for maintaining order within the college community.
 - a. Do you have an institutional policy with regard to
 - ☐ No, the institution should not have a policy on this subject. (If you choose this alternative, proceed to the next page.)
 - ☐ No, but we maintain an institutional concern with this matter. (If so, answer the following question and then proceed on to the next page: "Under what circumstances, if any, would your institution find it necessary to take administrative action in this area?")
 - ☐ Yes (If so, what is it?)
 - b. Is this policy (check only one)
 - ☐ formally adopted and systematically communicated?
 - ☐ formally adopted but not systematically communicated?
 - ☐ not formally adopted but systematically communicated?
 - ☐ agreed upon within the administration?
 - ☐ simply a matter of consistent practice?
 - c. Who formulated this policy? (check one)
 - ☐ the governing board of the institution
 - ☐ a college-wide administrative council
 - ☐ student personnel staff (only)
 - ☐ faculty committee (with administrative representation)
 - ☐ faculty committee (without administrative representation)
 - ☐ student-faculty committee (including administration)
 - ☐ student government
 - ☐ other: specify _____
 - d. What is the purpose and rationale of this policy?
 - e. Is the policy implemented consistently?

- f. Who handles violations?
- g. What are the usual consequences of violation of this policy?
- h. Do you feel that the above policy as implemented represents the most desirable approach to the problem?
 _____ Yes
 _____ No—if not, what would you prefer?
10. Please rank order these eighteen topics in terms of the degree to which they constitute a matter for significant concern on your campus.
- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. The excessive use of alcohol | _____ |
| 2. Deviant sexual behavior | _____ |
| 3. Drugs (narcotics, hallucinogens, marijuana, stimulants) | _____ |
| 4. Premarital pregnancy | _____ |
| 5. Student dress and appearance | _____ |
| 6. Financial irresponsibility (e. g. unpaid bill with the college, loan repayments, bad checks) | _____ |
| 7. Women's hours | _____ |
| 8. Required on-campus living | _____ |
| 9. Entertainment of members of the opposite sex in residence hall bedrooms | _____ |
| 10. Unacceptable off-campus conduct | _____ |
| 11. Student demonstrators (picketing, sit-ins, etc.) on social issues. | _____ |
| 12. The provision of contraceptives | _____ |
| 13. The invitation of controversial speakers to campus | _____ |
| 14. Official recognition of student organizations (including the requirement of faculty advisers) | _____ |
| 15. Faculty drinking with students | _____ |
| 16. The specific nature of the responsibility of student publications to the college administration or faculty | _____ |
| 17. The use of student records | _____ |
| 18. The use of students as research subjects | _____ |
11. Please indicate any issues involving institutional policy other than the above which have been of major concern to you as a dean of students.

APPENDIX C

Supplementary Tables

TABLE 44
Consistency of Policy Implementation

Category	Very Good	Reasonably or Fairly Good	Not Very Good	Number Responding
<i>Percentage Distribution</i>				
Controversial Speakers	96	1	3	116
Demonstrations	96	4		53
Deviant Sexual Behavior	89	7	4	54
Dress and Appearance	73	13	14	79
Drugs	86	12	2	84
Excessive Use of Alcohol	88	7	5	119
Entertainment Res. Hall Bdrms	95	2	3	127
Faculty-Student Drinking	86	2	12	43
Financial Irresponsibility	94	5	1	134
Off-Campus Misconduct	79	19	2	126
Premarital Pregnancy	97	3	-	66
Provision of Contraceptives	96	-	4	52
Publications	85	4	11	53
Required On-Campus Living	94	2	4	124
Recognition Stdnt Organizations	98	1	1	164
Student Records	98	1	1	104
Use of Stdnts as Res. Subjs	88	4	8	24
Women's Hours	98	1	1	159

TABLE 45
Desirability of the Policies

Category	Desirable Approach to the Problems	Not the Most Desirable Approach	Number Responding
<i>Percentage Distribution</i>			
Controversial Speakers	93	7	126
Demonstrations	100		60
Deviant Sexual Behavior	91	9	60
Dress and Appearance	83	17	83
Drugs	89	11	90
Excessive Use of Alcohol	92	8	122
Entertainment Res. Hall Bdrms	91	9	134
Faculty-Student Drinking	93	7	52
Financial Irrespnsbty	92	8	143
Off-Campus Misconduct	89	11	125
Premarital Pregnancy	96	4	68
Provision of Contraceptives	98	2	56
Publications	89	11	55
Required On-Campus Living	90	10	125
Recognition Stdnt Organizations	96	4	165
Student Records	97	3	111
Use of Stdnts as Research Subjs	97	3	31
Women's Hours	82	18	156

TABLE 46
How Were the Policies Established?

Category	Formally Adopted, Systematically Communicated	Formally Adopted, Not Systematically Communicated	Not Formally Adopted, but (?) Systematically Communicated	Agreed Upon with the Administration	Consistent Practice	Number Responding
<i>Percentage Distribution</i>						
Controv. Spkers	65	5	7	13	10	130
Demonstrations	58	2	12	12	16	64
Deviant Sexual Behavior	23	3	10	25	39	67
Dress & Appearance	71	7	8	1	13	85
Drugs	28	4	10	27	31	106
Excessive Use of Alcohol	76	3	2	6	13	130
Entertainment in Res. Hall Bdms.	79	2	7	7	5	135
Fac. Drink/Stdnts	41	1	12	14	32	57
Fin. Irrespnsbty	47	2	14	17	20	149
Off-Campus Misconduct	68	2	7	9	14	140
Premarital Pregnancy	18	4	11	34	33	76
Provision of Contraceptives	16	12	7	25	40	60
Publications	61	8	8	8	15	62
Required On-Campus Living	91		1	4	4	132
Recgn. Stdnt. Orgns.	85	3	4	4	4	170
Student Records	39	6	12	21	17	119
Use of Stdnts. as Research Subjects	20	9	15	20	36	34
Women's Hours	95	1	1	2	1	163

TABLE 47
Who Formulated the Policies?

Category	Gov. Board	Admin. Coun- cil	Stud. Person. Staff	Fac. Admin. Com.	Fac. Com.	Stud. Fac.-Adm. Com.	Stud. Govt.	Others	Number Respond- ing
<i>Percentage Distribution</i>									
Controv. Spkers	28	26	5	5	1	16	1	18	129
Demonstrations	9	21	16	12		26		16	57
Deviant Sexual Behavior	13	11	42	6		11		17	54
Dress & Appearance	6	15	12	6		26	18	17	82
Drugs	9	15	38	6		14		18	99
Excessive Use of Alcohol	28	16	11	7		23	1	14	121
Entertainment in Res. Hall Bdrms.	20	18	18	6	1	22	3	12	130
Fac. Drink/Stdnts	32	26	1			7		34	51
Financial Irrespnsbty	22	31	19	3		8	1	16	144
Off-Campus Misconduct	11	20	16	5	1	29	3	15	139
Premarital Pregnancy	6	12	47	9	3	8		15	74
Provision of Contraceptives	7	9	32	3	2	3	2	42	59
Publications	18	26	3	9	2	28		14	57
Required On- Campus Living	42	24	7	5		9		13	127
Recgn. Stdnt. Orgns.	10	15	8	6		34	11	16	170
Student Records	7	33	34	7		3		16	113
Use of Stdnts. as Research Subjects	3	35	17	7		3		35	29
Women's Hours	5	10	9	3		32	16	25	160

TABLE 48
Who Acted on Violations of the Policies?

Category	Personnel Dean/Staff	University Conduct Committee	Student Committee	University- Student Conduct Committee	President	Academic Dean	Health or Counseling Staff	Business Office	Campus Police	Civil Authorities	Number Responding
<i>Percentage Distribution</i>											
Controv. Spkers	62	12	3	10	9	3				1	81
Demonstrations	54	15	6	17	4				4		52
Deviant Sexual Behavior	42	25	23				5		3	2	60
Dress and Appearance	51	1	25	23							82
Drugs	42	19	8	19		2	7			3	86
Excessive Use of Alcohol	33	10	15	38	1		1		1	1	122
Entertainment in Res. Hall Bdrms.	48	8	22	21		1					130
Fac. Drink/Stdnts	40	3		9	23	19				6	36
Fin. Irrespnsbty	61	2	5	3				29			138
Off-Campus Misconduct	46	18	11	24		1					133
Premarital Preg.	68	13		3	6	3	7				69
Provision of Contraceptives	(Not Applicable)										
Publications	20	63	5	6	6						45
Recgn. Stdnt. Org.	48	10	22	18	1	2					135
Required On- Campus Living	88	1	2	8				1			105
Student Records	60	1		1	13	20				5	62
Use of Stdnts. as Research Subjs.	52	5			5	33				5	21
Women's Hours	25	1	52	21		1					157

TABLE 49
What Action Was Taken When the Policies Were Violated?

Category	Disciplinary Counseling; Req. to move	Warning or Reprimand	Fine; Work; Limit. priv.; Probation; Req. lv. area	Suspension; Dismissal; Expulsion	Depends on Nature of case	Number Responding
Controv. Spkers	24	7	42	3	24	52
Demonstrations	5	8	24	21	42	38
Deviant Sexual Behavior	27	1	10	32	30	60
Dress & Appearance	25	27	27	1	20	85
Drugs	22	1	2	40	35	94
Excessive Use of Alcohol	19	3	33	10	35	145
Entertainment in Res. Hall Bdrms.	1	13	29	31	26	161
Fac. Drink/Stdnts		(Not applicable)				
Financial Irrespnsbty		(Not applicable)				
Off-Campus Misconduct	11	3	16	18	52	148
Premarital Pregnancy	14	2	9	63	12	65
Provision of Contraceptives		(Not applicable)				
Publications	61	5	10		24	32
Required On- Campus Living	47	3	13	26	11	102
Recgn. Stdnt. Orgns.	9	3	57	5	26	115
Student Records	47	5	6	15	27	38
Use of Stdnts. as Research Subjects		(Not applicable)				
Women's Hours	11	3	44	11	31	171

TABLE 50
Rank Ordering of Issues on the Basis of Their Significance to the Institutions

Issue	Average Rank	Order Based on Average Rank	Number Responding*
Excessive Use of Alcohol	3.33	1	295
Off Campus Misconduct	5.67	2	276
Women's Hours	6.44	3	260
Dress and Appearance	6.59	4	274
Financial Irresponsibility	7.08	5	265
Required On-Campus Living	7.55	6	254
Publications	7.87	7	255
Drugs	8.02	8	254
Deviant Sexual Behavior	8.30	9	243
Premarital Pregnancy	8.94	10	241
Entertainment in Residence Hall Bedrooms	9.21	11	246
Recognition of Student Organizations	9.47	12	246
Demonstrations	9.98	13	245
Controversial Speakers	10.00	14	245
Student Records	10.35	15	251
Faculty-Student Drinking	12.69	16	238
Provision of Contraceptives	13.48	17	224
Use of Students as Research Subjects	13.87	18	242

**The sample size was 348 since both forms A and B of the questionnaire contained the same item on ranking of the issues.*